

The state and communism

F. BURLATSKY

F. Burlatsky

**The
state
and
communism**



**PROGRESS PUBLISHERS
M o s c o w**

Printed in Soviet Union

TRANSLATED FROM THE RUSSIAN BY VIC SCHNEIERSON

Ф. БУРЛАЦКИЙ

ГОСУДАРСТВО И КОММУНИЗМ

На английском языке

CONTENTS

Introduction	
THE NEW STAGE	5
Chapter One	
THE MODERN BOURGEOIS STATE	15
Chapter Two	
THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT IN OUR TIME	39
Chapter Three	
THE STATE OF THE WHOLE PEOPLE (TRANSITION FROM THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT TO THE STATE OF THE WHOLE PEOPLE)	78
Chapter Four	
THE STATE OF THE WHOLE PEOPLE (ITS FEATURES, TASKS AND FUNCTIONS)	95
Chapter Five	
THE STATE OF THE WHOLE PEOPLE AND ITS SOCIO-POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS	119
Chapter Six	
COMMUNIST SELF-GOVERNMENT IN THE MAKING	146
Conclusion	
TWO WORLDS-TWO TRENDS OF POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT	174

INTRODUCTION

THE NEW STAGE

The brilliant genius of Lenin, the great teacher of the working people of the world whose name will live for ever, illumines mankind's road to communism.

Programme of the C.P.S.U.

Big things, they say, are better seen from a distance, and new things are better appreciated after a lapse of time. This may be true in some cases. But not always, and there is no better example to unprove it than the way world opinion received the idea of a state of the whole people put forward in the new Programme of the C.P.S.U.

It is not too much to say that the idea of a state of the whole people is one of the most sparkling scientific discoveries of Marxist-Leninist thought in our time. The Programme of the C.P.S.U., adopted at the 22nd Party Congress in 1961, defines the substance, the tasks and functions of a state that serves communist construction and is the transitional form to public communist self-government and the withering away of statehood.

Take this ordinary fact. The state, as such, has existed for thousands of years. Always, it has been an instrument whereby one class dominated others and one section of society suppressed the other. It was not until our time that social affairs had matured to a point where, in the Soviet Union, the substance of the state changed radically under the impact of the socialist revolution. The state that had once served one class, gradually came to represent all society and became a vehicle of its will, its interests, its ideals and goals.

This is much more than a new development on just the Soviet scene. It is a milestone in the political history of mankind. As other nations embark on socialist and communist construction, the Soviet experience will undoubtedly benefit them.

The conclusions and plans of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union concerning the development of the state attracted the attention of all students of the Party Programme. To be sure, the various classes considered it from their own standpoint. Their points of view on the dictatorship of the proletariat growing into a state of the whole people differ. But even the strongest opponents of communism do not deny the immense, genuinely historic impact of the developments proceeding in the Soviet land.

Naturally, it was in the world communist and working-class movement that Soviet experience evoked the greatest interest. The leaders of fraternal parties in the socialist countries had nothing but admiration for the creative approach shown in the Programme of the C.P.S.U. with regard to the socialist state. They emphasised the importance this Soviet experience has for the world socialist community in their addresses to the 22nd Congress of the C.P.S.U., and then at plenary meetings of their own parties.

Despite the disparity of national and historical features in the various socialist countries, the basic objective laws governing the transition to communism are common to all of them. The Soviet Union is the first to be breaking the road, so it tests and selects the most suitable forms and methods of communist construction.

The discussion of the results of the 22nd Congress of the C.P.S.U. by the Communist Parties of capitalist countries gave prominence to questions related to the Soviet state. A lively debate ensued in the communist and socialist press of Italy, France and other countries, showing that interest in the proposition on the state of the whole people was very great.

The ideas of the Communist Party Programme roused the interest of the revolutionary movements of the Asian, African and South American continents. The Soviet Union, which has successfully resolved the question of national minorities and secured genuine equality among the nations of the socialist state, is a beacon for all the peoples of the world.

It was stressed at the 22nd Congress, and reaffirmed by the communist movement, that the Party Programme ushered in a new stage in the materialisation of the revolutionary theory of Marx, Engels and Lenin.

It is not to be wondered at that Marxist-Leninist theory is continuously developing, that it gains new ideas and

draws new conclusions. Lenin has repeatedly said in unison with the founders of Marxism that the Marxist teaching is not a dogma but a guide to action. No other teaching in history has been so closely associated with revolutionary practice, none has exercised so immense an influence on the development of human society. And if it has served so truly as an instrument for the transformation of the world, as an unerring compass in the practical revolutionary activity of the masses, this is due to the fact that it always kept pace with reality and secured the right solutions.

"We do not regard Marx's theory as something completed and inviolable," Lenin wrote. "On the contrary, we are convinced that it has only laid the foundation stone of the science which Socialists *must* develop in all directions if they wish to keep pace with life."¹

All the Communist and Workers' Parties, all the creative Marxist-Leninist theorists, make their contribution, big or small, to the advancement of this science. Comes a day when all this communist thought is summed up. It appears in a new light. Then Marxist thinking ascends to a qualitatively new level, and a new stage begins in the development of scientific communism.

Why have we reason to say today, after the new Party Programme has been adopted, that we have come to such a new stage? Well, the Programme has summed up the giant experience gained by the communist, working-class and national liberation movement after Lenin. The Programme deals with a whole epoch, an epoch one may safely describe as the brightest and most complex in the history of the human race. It is marked by the transition of mankind from capitalism to socialism. It is an epoch of communist construction in the U.S.S.R. and of the completion of socialist construction in the other countries of the socialist community. The peoples are stamping out colonialism. The two-thirds of mankind whom the imperialists barred from the mainstream of civilisation, are stepping to the forefront.

The Programme provides answers to the numerous highly complicated questions facing mankind in our time.

Whatever is said about the trail-blazing nature of the Party Programme as a whole also refers to its various parts,

¹ Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, pp. 211-12.

the study of the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the state included. The ideas set out in the Programme on this score, especially concerning the role of the state during the transition to communism, advance Marxist-Leninist theory creatively to fit present conditions.

Marx and Engels, the founders of scientific communism, developed a materialist conception of history and demonstrated that dictatorship of the proletariat is the only possible road to socialism. They analysed the origin and substance of the state, the dialectical connection between society and the state, and revealed the true nature of the bourgeois state and bourgeois democracy. They defined the essential features of a socialist state and described the conditions in which it would wither away under communism. In our time, with socialism solidly established in a large part of the world inhabited by more than 1,000 million people, one cannot help admiring the keen foresight of Marx and Engels. The teaching they created has stood the test of practice brilliantly and illumines the road to communism for all mankind.

The next, Leninist stage in the development of scientific communism—and this includes the teaching on the state—came at the time when pre-monopoly capitalism grew into imperialism. Lenin made a deep analysis of capitalism in its last, imperialist stage, revealing the basic features of the imperialist state. He embellished upon Marx's theory on the dictatorship of the proletariat with regard to this new epoch, and defined the nature of the socialist state, its tasks and its distinctive features. Lenin discovered Soviet power as a form of proletarian dictatorship. He advanced the idea of federation for the Soviet Socialist Republics, worked out the principles of the relations the U.S.S.R. should have with bourgeois countries, and set out the general objective laws governing the development of the socialist state during the transition from socialism to communism.

The Programme of the C.P.S.U. is based entirely on the scientific conclusions and ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin. At the same time, it makes a new, substantial step forward as regards the theory of the socialist state.

The elucidation of the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the state in the Programme is based on an analysis of the experience of the socialist state in the U.S.S.R. and the

People's Democracies and the practice of the imperialist countries and the economically underdeveloped countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. One may safely say that every important aspect of the theory of the state has been treated in the Programme in the light of the new facts. But for all that, it is the idea of the state of the whole people, the definition of the role, tasks and functions of the state during the transition to communism, and the conditions in which the state will wither away, that take precedence. They are the biggest contribution made after Lenin to the theory of the state.

Ushering in a new stage in the development of socialist theory, the Programme of the C.P.S.U. continues its struggle against the ideological trends that have opposed Marxism ever since its inception. It will be recalled that the communist teaching on the state emerged and developed in acute struggle against bourgeois and opportunist ideology. At every new stage of the working-class movement, the proletariat, its party, and its theorists have had to deal with new opponents.

At the time of Marx and Engels it was anarchists such as Bakunin and Proudhon who were the chief danger with their theories of "exploding" or dissolving the state in Utopia-like, autonomous, unconnected associations. Marxism also had to combat reformist and Left sectarian opportunist theories. Ferdinand Lassalle, on the one hand, and Louis-Auguste Blanqui, on the other, represented two extreme trends in the socialist movement in general, and as regards the role of the state in the struggle for socialism, in particular. Lassalle underestimated the importance of revolutionary violence and idealised bourgeois democracy. Blanqui overestimated violence and believed that state compulsion was the chief factor in the building of socialism. These two theorists were the antipodes in the petty-bourgeois approach to the socialist teaching. As you see, the embryos of the various theories that oppose scientific socialism to this day, appeared back in Marx's time.

Anarchism still had some influence in the working-class movement in Lenin's time. Lenin had to deal with the followers of Bakunin and other anarchists. But Right opportunism, or reformism, was particularly widespread. The reformist movement was represented chiefly by Bernstein and other

leaders of the Second International¹ who had evolutionised to reformism and reconciliation. When proletarian revolution loomed big in the capitalist countries, the conciliators obstructed it with their theories of a gradual and peaceful development of socialism, their idealisation of the bourgeois state and their rejection of the idea of overthrowing bourgeois power and replacing it with the dictatorship of the proletariat. Lenin was therefore absolutely right in fighting Right opportunism tooth and nail, because at the time it was the main danger to the working-class movement.

Left opportunism, too, grew into a distinct danger, particularly after the October Revolution. Trotsky was a typical representative of this trend in the Soviet Republic. He cloaked his lack of faith in the victory of the October Revolution with shrill calls for world revolution. Within the country he advocated the stiffest of military and bureaucratic methods. Lenin's resolute opposition to Trotskyism in the field of theory, and to bureaucracy in practice, shows how important he thought it was to combat Left opportunist tendencies.

By now anarchist theories of "exploding" the state have lost nearly all followers in the working-class movement. But conciliatory and Right opportunist theories are in full bloom. The Social-Democratic movement, which in Lenin's day still retained the outer cloak of revolutionary Marxism and had not yet entirely rejected the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat, is today an apologist of bourgeois democracy. Not surprisingly, therefore, the Programme of the C.P.S.U. levels criticism at the Right opportunist and revisionist views on the role of the bourgeois and socialist states.

The gravity of the consequences of Left opportunist mistakes has been brought home more clearly today than ever

¹ Second International—an international association of socialist parties founded in 1889. The upswing of the revolutionary movement and the spread of Marxism, coupled with the growth of socialist parties and trade unions in the 1880s, set the stage for the revival of the First International, disbanded in 1876. The Second International, led until 1895 by Frederick Engels, developed at first as a proletarian organisation based on Marxism. After Engels died in 1895, opportunist elements came to the fore in it and set to revising Marxist revolutionary doctrine.

The militant traditions of the First International founded by Marx and Engels were continued by the Third Communist International founded by Vladimir Lenin.

before. The spread of Left sectarian, dogmatic views is one of the negative upshots in the world communist movement of the Stalin cult. They have done great harm to the struggle for socialism and have detracted from the influence of Marxism-Leninism. The struggle against Left opportunism was underrated and neglected in Stalin's time, and as a result the ailment is no more an infantile disorder. In our day, when peoples of countries with different levels of economic and social development are embarking on socialism, there is fertile soil for "Leftist" communism. This trend has always flourished in an unstable environment, resulting in leaps from one extreme to another by members of the petty bourgeoisie. The Left sectarian disorder feeds on nationalism and, in turn, nourishes nationalism.

The Soviet Communists have always combated both Right and Left opportunism, the latter being no less dangerous than revisionism especially at the present time.

The harm done to the Soviet land by the cult of the individual has shown that the building of the new society will be considerably retarded if we do not combat Left opportunism, exaggeration of the role of force, and all forms of red tape. Elimination of the personality cult and its consequences has paved the way to successful communist construction and has enabled the Party to restore and develop Lenin's ideas in the Programme of the C.P.S.U.

Not only has the Party restored Leninist standards in the country. It has also purged the Marxist-Leninist teaching of all the perversions of the personality cult.

Lenin developed the theoretical principles and laid the foundation of the new type of state, in which the people is the sole master.

We may not find any direct reference to a state of the whole people in anything Lenin wrote or said, but it was Lenin all the same who gave substance to the conclusion that the dictatorship of the proletariat will be needed only for the "period of transition from capitalism to socialism"¹ He proved, too, that the state would still be required to effect the transition to communism after all the class antagonisms will have been removed. Lenin outlined in general terms what the tasks of such a state would be. He wrote that under

¹ Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, Part 2, p. 209.

socialism "there remains the need for a state, which, while safeguarding the public ownership of the means of production, would safeguard equality in labour and equality in the distribution of products".¹

Elsewhere he spoke of the need of such a state in order to implement control over "the measure of labour and the measure of consumption".²

The definition of the socialist state given in the Programme of the C.P.S.U. goes back terminologically to Lenin's formulations. Lenin wrote that under socialism all citizens "become employees and workers of a single nationwide state 'syndicate'".³

A more specific answer to what the state of a developed socialist society will be has first been furnished in our time. That we have come to a new stage in the development of socialist democracy and that a new step forward has been made in the theory of the Soviet state, is due largely to the revival of Leninist principles.

The Party revived and developed Lenin's ideas about the fundamental and distinctive forms and methods of transition from socialism to communism. Lenin emphasised that the methods of building communism, which develops on its own foundation, will differ substantially from the methods of building socialism.

"In its first phase, or first stage," Lenin wrote, "communism *cannot* as yet be fully ripe economically and entirely free from traditions or traces of capitalism."⁴

The transition from capitalism to socialism proceeds in an environment of class struggle. It calls for a radical break-up of social relations, for a deep-going social revolution and for dictatorship of the proletariat.

In contrast, the transition to communism, as the C.C. noted in its Report on the Programme of the C.P.S.U. to the 22nd Congress, proceeds in a society that has no exploiting classes and in which all members of society are not only vitally interested in the new system, but are consciously working for its victory. It is natural therefore that communist construction is effected by democratic methods, which

¹ Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, Part 1, p. 298.

² *Ibid.*, p. 300.

³ Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, Part 1, p. 304.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 302.

obviate class struggle within the country and the dictatorship of the proletariat, witnessing a gradual improvement of social relations, disappearance of old and appearance of new forms of life, their fusion and interaction. The people participate consciously in communist construction and in the administration of the state. Thus, society avoids the losses that usually attend class struggle within the country. This is the reason why the rates of social development gain pace during the transition to communism.

The Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. and the Soviet Government levelled criticism at the personality cult. They are making sure there will be no recurrence of it in the future. They are making sure that the Leninist principles of socialist democracy, economic and cultural growth and rising standards of living, prevail.

Leaders of the Communist and Workers' Parties stressed the importance of the policy charted by the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. János Kádár, First Secretary of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, pointed this out at the 22nd Congress of the C.P.S.U.

"We are convinced," he said, "that the fact that the 22nd Congress confirms and continues the line of the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U., which has been incalculably important, will inject new and immense strength into the whole world communist movement. The 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. has released the world communist movement from the trammels of dogmatism and has enriched Marxist-Leninist theory with new basic postulates. It ushered in a new victorious stage in the life not only of the Soviet people, but also of the whole socialist camp. This stage has yielded, and continues to yield, magnificent results. It has caused a new upswing of struggle for socialism and peace throughout the world."

The Marxist-Leninist Parties, which have gained a good lesson from the struggle against the consequences of the personality cult, have gone forward. The congresses held by the fraternal parties of Bulgaria, Hungary and Czechoslovakia in 1962, and of the German Democratic Republic in 1963, stressed the historic impact which the 20th and 22nd congresses of the C.P.S.U. have had on the whole world communist movement.

The Programme of the C.P.S.U., which maps the country's prospective economic, social and cultural development, con-

tains an exhaustive appraisal of the historical experience of the Soviet state in the past, and of its role and tasks in the present and future. It furnishes an analysis of the experience of the whole system of socialist states, and examines the tendencies evident in the contemporary bourgeois state.

To obtain an idea of what propositions the Programme contains with regard to the Marxist-Leninist theory of the state, we ought to delve into the following questions:

the modern bourgeois state and how the working class gains power; the historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat; state of the whole people; transition to communist public self-government, and the conditions in which the state withers away.

THE MODERN BOURGEOIS STATE

The state has become a committee for the management of the affairs of the monopoly bourgeoisie.

The example of victorious socialism is revolutionising the minds of the working people of the capitalist world; it inspires them to fight against imperialism and greatly facilitates their struggle.

Programme of the C.P.S.U.

Let us first look at the trends evident in the development of the contemporary bourgeois state, at the methods of the revolutionary overthrow of bourgeois power and the conquest of power by the working class. This will help us understand the new elements injected by the Programme of the C.P.S.U. into the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

It should be borne in mind that the forms assumed by the proletarian state, and the methods of its work, depend very greatly on the specific conditions in which the working-class struggle for power proceeds, on the opponents and allies it has in this struggle, on the means it employs and the price it pays for victory.¹

It is also important to understand the character and policy of the modern bourgeois states in order to obtain a clearer picture of the international milieu in which the Soviet state exists today, and to appreciate the purposes of its foreign policy.

MINIONS OF THE MONOPOLIES

The first to define the true substance of the capitalist system generally, and the capitalist state in particular, were Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, the founders of scientific communism.

¹ We shall confine ourselves to an examination of the tendencies evident in the development of the imperialist states, such as the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany, France and Britain. We shall not deal with the newly independent national states of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Marx and Engels exposed the class character of all the states that ever existed, including the bourgeois.

"The state," they wrote, "is nothing more than the form of organisation which the bourgeois necessarily adopt both for internal and external purposes, for the mutual guarantee of their property and interests."¹

Later, in developing the Marxist conception of the state, Engels produced the following remarkably accurate definition:

"It is, as a rule, the state of the most powerful, economically dominant class, which, through the medium of the state, becomes also the politically dominant class, and thus acquires new means of holding down and exploiting the oppressed class."²

This is a very accurate definition of the bourgeois state. The bourgeois state is an instrument for protecting the capitalist system, for suppressing and oppressing the workers and other working people.

The Marxist conclusion that it is necessary to scrap the machinery of state (army, police, courts, and executive power) in the course of socialist revolution is of utmost importance. Here is how Marx put it:

"All revolutions perfected this machine instead of smashing it."³

Lenin considered this conclusion one of the most important in the Marxist teaching on the state.

He developed it, and showed that after capitalism entered the imperialist stage, the state became a minion of the monopolies. The bureaucracy expanded, and so did the military establishment. Monopoly capital gradually became fused with the state. He wrote:

"Imperialism—the era of bank capital, the era of gigantic capitalist monopolies, the era of the development of monopoly capitalism into state-monopoly capitalism—has demonstrated with particular force an extraordinary strengthening of the 'state machine' and an unprecedented growth of its bureaucratic and military apparatus, in connection with the

¹ Marx, Engels, *The German Ideology*, Moscow, 1964, p. 78.

² Marx, Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, Moscow, p. 320.

³ Marx, Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, p. 333.

intensification of repressive measures against the proletariat both in the monarchical and in the freest, republican countries.

"World history is now undoubtedly leading on an incomparably larger scale than in 1852 to the 'concentration of all the forces' of the proletarian revolution on the 'destruction' of the state machine."¹

It will be recalled that Marx and Engels set Britain and the United States apart in this respect, because those two countries had not yet developed their bureaucratic and military establishment to any marked degree. Marx and Engels believed for this reason that in those two countries revolution was possible without the preliminary destruction of the machinery of state.

Lenin analysed the development of Britain and the United States in the imperialist stage, and especially at the time of the First World War. He proved that by then those two countries had "completely sunk into the all-European filthy, bloody morass of bureaucratic-military institutions which subordinate everything to themselves and trample everything underfoot".² Lenin pointed out that Marx's and Engels's reservation no longer applied.

The Programme of the C.P.S.U. has added depth to Lenin's analysis of imperialism with respect to state-monopoly capitalism in our time. It takes note of the new features of the bourgeois state, which did not exist in Lenin's time, or existed in embryo.

Firstly, there has been a still greater shrinking of the social basis of the bourgeois state. At the time of classical capitalism the state leaned not only on the big bourgeoisie, but also on a more or less numerous section of petty bourgeois. Today, the bourgeois state has, in effect, become "a committee for the management of the affairs of the monopoly bourgeoisie".³ The mammoth monopolies control the bulk of social production and thus rule the life of their nation. Monopoly capitalism has grown into state-monopoly capitalism, which combines the strength of the monopolies and that

¹ Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, Part 1, pp. 231-32.

² *Ibid.*, p. 238.

³ *The Road to Communism*, p. 471.

of the state into a single mechanism whose purpose it is to enrich the monopolies, suppress the working-class movement and the national liberation struggle, save the capitalist system, and launch aggressive wars.

Secondly, the development of monopoly and state-monopoly capitalism has induced direct interference by the state in the process of capitalist reproduction in behalf of the monopolies. It is in their interests that the bourgeois state enforces various regulations and nationalises some branches of the economy. The distinctive feature of the modern bourgeois state is that it invades the sphere of economic development more and more actively in behalf of the monopolies.

State property has increased considerably in the capitalist countries after the war. This is due to a further expansion of state-monopoly capitalism and, largely, to the nature of the modern productive forces. Mostly the state has invaded those new branches of production which call for very high primary investments, such as the atomic industry and cybernetics. Besides, often the monopolies wish the state to bear the burden of running unprofitable industries. This has happened in Britain, where the coal industry, the railways and the power stations—all of them none too profitable—were nationalised. The former proprietors of these industries gained the most from this nationalisation, for they withdrew their capital and transferred it into more profitable spheres of production. In addition, the state acquired property wherever the working-class movement succeeded in compelling it to do so. This, for one, is true of Austria after the Second World War. But irrespective of how state property originates, the imperialist bourgeois state uses it to consolidate the power of monopoly capital.

One more feature of state-monopoly capitalism is that the state invades labour-capital relations. It strives to suppress the discontent of the masses and to take the edge off their struggle against the industrialists. Quite often, the bourgeois state institutes certain control over wages, establishes obligatory mediation, restricts or bans strikes, and exerts pressure on the trade union movement.

Thirdly, the development of state-monopoly capitalism has brought about an unprecedented militarisation of the economy and all other affairs in the imperialist countries.

Suffice it to say that ten to fifteen per cent of the national income is annually allocated by the imperialist states for military expenditures. Militarisation has economic roots. The imperialists consider it a means of shoring up their tottering economy. But it also has political roots, and that is the main thing. Imperialism is building up armies and stockpiling arms for struggle against the socialist countries and the revolutionary working-class and national liberation movements. There is a direct connection between the growth of militarism and the offensive mounted by the reactionaries in the capitalist countries. One nourishes the other. Militarism is the most evil feature of the reactionary bourgeois system.

Domestic policy becomes increasingly reactionary under the influence of militarism. The sharp post-war turn towards reaction in the capitalist countries was due largely to the venomous cold war environment.

Fourthly, the active economic intervention of the capitalist state in behalf of monopoly capital, militarisation and the sharpening of the class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat—these and other reasons have led to an unheard-of growth of the military and bureaucratic machine. Immense changes have taken place in this respect since the period of classical capitalism.

In the beginning of the 19th century the Federal Government of the United States employed something like 1,000 officials. Today, their number tops 2,500,000. In his *Juggernaut: The Warfare State*, New York, 1961, author Fred J. Cook produces revealing facts about the militarisation of the U.S. economy and the role played by militarists in the United States.

The author emphasises that the group of capitalists controlling the war industry and the professional soldiers bend U.S. policy to their will and obstruct a peaceful resolution of international problems. The increasing power of this "war-industrial complex", he writes, creates a grave danger to world peace and to whatever still survives of American democracy.

In the eight years of Eisenhower's administration, Cook notes, the country spent more than \$350,000 million for military purposes, and adds that military spending under the new administration continued to grow.

"This cascade of billions," Cook writes, "has given the Pentagon an economic power that reaches into every nook and cranny of the nation."

The military assets are triple the assets of United States Steel, American Telephone and Telegraph, Metropolitan Life Insurance, General Motors and Standard Oil of New Jersey combined. The paid personnel of the Defence Department, the author says, exceeds the aggregate personnel of the big corporations three times over. "These two tremendous power complexes—the Military and Big Business," Cook goes on to say, "join in an inevitable meeting of minds over billions of dollars in contracts the one has to award and the other to fulfil."

About \$21,000 million of the war budget for the 1960/61 fiscal year which ended on June 30, 1961, were spent on purchases of war materials. One hundred top corporations "carved up three-quarters of the enormous pie, the top ten getting \$7.6 billion". Three corporations got more than \$1,000 million each in war orders. They were General Dynamics (\$1,260 million), and Lockheed and Boeing (a little over \$1,000 million each). Two other corporations—General Electric and North American Aviation—each received more than \$900 million in war orders.

The Defence Department has 3,500,000 people, including 947,000 civilians. In addition, 4,000,000 people are employed in the various war industries.

"This means," Cook writes, "that a total of some 7.5 million Americans depend for their jobs directly upon the Military—almost precisely one-tenth of the nation's entire labour force."

It is not surprising, therefore, that the U.S. rulers are consumed by the urge to proceed with the armaments drive.

Growth of military and civil bureaucracy is also typical of the other imperialist countries. In his scathing pamphlet, *Law, the Pursuit of Progress*, Cyril Northcote Parkinson describes the precipitous growth of the bureaucracy and the ebbing influence of parliamentary institutions in Britain, that Mecca of bourgeois democracy. Here is one of the examples given by the author: the Colonial Office of Britain employed 372 people in 1935. In 1954, though Britain had lost most of its colonies by then, its personnel increased to 1,661. This

personnel discharges direct assignments for finance capital, designed to squeeze profits out of the former colonies.

Fifthly, the unprecedented growth of taxes and state loans, which bear down heavily on the working people, is bound up with the growth of the military and bureaucratic machinery and the increased interference of the bourgeois state in the economy. No more than a few per cent of the national income was withdrawn as taxes in the United States and Britain at the turn of the century. By 1960 these withdrawals amounted to nearly one-quarter of the national income. The United States budget increased several dozen times over.

The development of all these features in the bourgeois states had a most adverse effect on the institutions of bourgeois democracy. "Capitalism in general and imperialism in particular," wrote Lenin, "turn democracy into an illusion—though at the same time capitalism engenders democratic aspirations in the masses, creates democratic institutions, aggravates the antagonism between imperialism's denial of democracy and the mass striving for democracy."¹

Imperialism is hostile to democracy. Such is its nature. Bourgeois democracy was congenial to the classical capitalism of free competition. It liberated the labourer from feudal dependence and granted him a minimum of rights, so that he could come to the market as "free" manpower. Furthermore, freedom of competition presupposed equality among commodity producers, free play of prices, non-interference by the state in economic relations, and the like.

But the situation changed radically when capitalism entered the stage of monopoly capitalism, and especially when it grew into state-monopoly capitalism. Monopoly capitalism usurped the national wealth and political power. It is the most predatory capitalism, striving for unlimited power within and without the country. Naturally, the democratic cloak, even the restricted and formal democracy in the capitalist countries, is too tight for it. It can suffer neither a parliament with opposition, nor the existence of workers' and other democratic parties, neither the elementary freedom of the press, nor the trade union movement.

¹ Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, pp. 24-25.

Fascism is a monstrous progeny of imperialist reaction. It stands for the complete suppression of any and all remnants of bourgeois-democratic rights and freedoms, for the suppression of opposition, for the crippling of parliament and for the extermination of the champions of the people. In the eyes of mankind, the gravest charge facing bourgeois democracy is that it failed to prevent the fascisation of the capitalist countries. Never will the savage crimes of the fascists, which put the Inquisition to shame, fade from the memory of mankind.

No trace of bourgeois democracy remained in the fascist countries. This revealed the danger for the people of the fusion of state power with that of the financial oligarchy. Every big manufacturer became a kind of state official at his own factory, and this put the workers at a disadvantage. Everything they did to safeguard their privileges and rights was branded as a subversive act, a crime against the state. The fascist atrocities in Oswiecim and Maidanek showed the world which way imperialism moves if it is not properly checked by the masses.

Fascism tried to drag mankind back to ignorance and wildness. It meant to wipe out civilisation. Not only progressives, but well-intentioned bourgeois as well, shuddered at fascism's terrible crimes. Yet, in one form or another, fascism is being revived in the countries of the self-styled free world. Wherever the monopolies prevail and the most bellicose section of imperialists gains the upper hand, fascism and authoritarianism make headway.

It would be wrong to say, however, that the reactionary tendencies in the capitalist countries are a straightforward and unpreventable process. The tendency to combat the monopolies and promote democracy and socialism has gained considerably in our time. Lenin discerned it when it first appeared.

Fascism is not preordained. Neither is authoritarianism, or rule of reactionary monopoly capital that stunts the parliamentary institutions and invests all power in the head of a bourgeois state or government. Monopoly capital faces strong opposition from the masses, who want democracy and are headed by the working class and its Communist Party.

The tendency of opposition has, far from subsiding, gained considerable ground. The anti-imperialist forces have grown

immeasurably throughout the world. This is true, too, of the capitalist countries, and refers mostly to the working class. The latter is incomparably better organised and united than it was 30 or 40 years ago. The democratic and liberation movements have also expanded.

In *State and Revolution*, Lenin pointed out in 1917 that Germany had the greatest number of "politically conscious and active hired slaves".

"One million members of the Social-Democratic Party—out of fifteen million wageworkers!" he wrote. "Three million organised in trade unions—out of fifteen million!"¹

Today, the situation in the capitalist countries has changed. To begin with, the working class of all the developed capitalist countries has its Communist Party. In Italy, for example, the Communist Party membership is 1,800,000. Its following is much greater still. In the 1963 election it gained 251 seats in parliament, and has a strong influence on the trade unions.

The French Communist Party, which has over 400,000 members, is the biggest party in the country. In the 1956 election, the last before the election law was so perversely changed, it won 151 seats. It exercises a very strong influence on French public affairs.

The Social-Democratic movement, too, has grown all over the world. It has an aggregate membership of some 13,000,000. The rank-and-file Socialists want peace and social progress, despite the conciliatory policy of their Rightist leadership.

All in all, a variety of forms of public activity has developed. There are today more than 1,700 international socio-economic, scientific and cultural organisations, of which many work for peace, democracy and progress. The World Federation of Trade Unions consists of trade unions with a total membership of 120,000,000. In many capitalist countries, it is true, the trade unions are strongly influenced by the reformist parties. Still, they are potentially a powerful force in the fight for a radical reconstruction of capitalist society.

This goes to show how much more organised the working class and all working people have become.

¹ Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, Part 1, p. 290.

The state of affairs in the bourgeois countries shows that Lenin's description of monopoly capitalism as the eve of socialist revolution is correct. Socialisation of production under state-monopoly capitalism is creating the necessary conditions for a transition to new society. "State-monopolistic capitalism," Lenin wrote, "is a complete *material* preparation for socialism, the *threshold* of socialism, a rung in the ladder of history between which and the rung called socialism *there are no intermediate rungs.*"¹

The political premises for transition to socialism are also more pronounced. All the contradictions of capitalism have grown more acute. Monopoly capital alienates the working class, the peasants and all the other democratic and anti-imperialist forces. They become organised in the course of the liberative struggle, coming face to face with the task of converting capitalist society into socialist society by revolutionary means.

REFORMIST AND REVISIONIST THEORIES

Bent on retaining the masses under their spell, the defenders of capitalism extoll the bourgeois state as the ideal of democracy and freedom. They call the capitalist world the "free world", and oppose it to the countries of the socialist system. They have devised many theories to whitewash capitalism. Among the most widespread is the theory that the modern bourgeois state acts in behalf of all the sections of society. Some Right-wing Social-Democrats tend to chime in, notably John Strachey, the Labour Party leader.

"A short definition of contemporary democracy," he writes in his *Contemporary Capitalism*, "which at least points towards its essential feature—and no definition can do more—is this: contemporary democracy is the diffusion of power throughout the community. And the diffusion of power pushed further and further points in turn towards the elimination of power. For if everyone could have exactly equal power, no one, clearly, would have any power over his fellows."

¹ Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, Part 1, p. 158.

If that is all his investigation could produce, then, bluntly, it is not much.

Democracy, he says, is "diffusion" or, in other words, dispersion of power in society. This smacks strongly of Proudhon. The latter, who was an ideologist of anarchism, maintained that power is the better, the less there is of it. But before reaching the point where political forms wither away, one still has to go through revolutionary social change on a socialist foundation. This is something that calls for power, and strong power at that, power capable of withstanding and suppressing the resistance of the capitalists. In other words, to speak of a "diffusion of power" in bourgeois society is, in effect, tantamount to rejecting socialism. There is no way the working class and all working people can win socialism other than by winning and consolidating power.

Strachey's definition of democracy, like the bourgeois conception of it, totally ignores the class content of power. What does "diffusion of power" mean? Is power diffused among the haves or the have-nots, and if it is diffused among both, then to what extent, and who remains at the helm of the economy, and of the government? Strachey's definition does not say it. Mind you, that is not an accident. So long as he remains a moderate social reformist, he cannot say it. On the contrary, as his views gain on him, we see him gravitate towards the bourgeois theorists.

Strachey's conclusion about the substance of contemporary Western democracy is worthless, too, because it goes against the facts. It is not diffusion of power, but the very reverse, that we witness today in the capitalist countries. We see power moving towards concentration and centralisation. State-monopoly capitalism has put strong economic levers into the hands of the capitalist state. It has made the state the biggest owner of capital. As for the purely political side of things, there is a tendency to enlarge executive power to the detriment of parliament. We see strong-arm governments appear, and authoritarianism and fascism.

Strachey's methodological error, and that of other social reformists, is easy to spot. Having abandoned Marxism, they have cut themselves off from the only scientific method of social analysis. There is also this other point: they turn their backs completely on the development of democracy in the socialist countries. It is highly deplorable that people

who call themselves Socialists scorn the vast store of pertinent experience accumulated by states representing one-third of mankind. This dooms the Right Socialists to the role of stragglers who trail behind the bourgeois apologists.

One theory has it that the state is independent in relation to society and in relation to the antagonistic classes of which society is composed. It is an old theory. After Marxism came into the world, opportunists argued against it by wrongly describing the state as a power standing above the classes and capable of protecting the workers against their bosses. Lassalle is the originator of this theory, and it has come down to the Right Socialists via Eduard Bernstein. The Socialist and Social-Democratic parties of Austria, Sweden, the Federal Republic of Germany and Switzerland say in their programmes that the bourgeois state is a supra-class power influenced by all the social forces and evolutionising in a direction most advantageous to the masses.

We might not have dealt with this question at such length if it were not connected with the recent ideological struggle against the revisionists. The revisionist standpoint with regard to the modern imperialist state is essentially similar to the traditional reformist conception. The only thing the revisionists did was to repattern this time-worn theory along more contemporary lines. They conceded that in the past the state in the capitalist countries really did serve the propertied classes. But, they said, when state capitalism developed the situation changed. They maintained that as the bourgeois state assumes economic functions, especially by nationalising some of the industries, its complexion alters, and claimed that in the circumstances the bourgeois state gains increasing independence vis-à-vis the monopolies and often operates against them in the interests of the masses. They averred that some of the social legislation passed by bourgeois governments under working-class pressure is an indication that the state is supra-class.

The revisionists imagine that nationalisation makes the bureaucracy managing the nationalised enterprises, and ultimately the state as a whole, more independent in relation to the antagonistic classes. Thus, they claim the state changes in nature and gradually sheds its class character.

To substantiate their theory, basically wrong in the scientific sense and harmful to socialism, the revisionists

marshal Marx's and Engels's postulates concerning independence of the *functioning* of the state in society.

Here are a few of the passages by Marx and Engels which the revisionists quote most frequently.

In his Introduction to Marx's *Civil War in France*, Frederick Engels wrote:

"What had been the characteristic attitude of the former state? Society had created its own organs to look after its common interests, originally through simple division of labour. But these organs, at whose head was the state power, had in the course of time, in pursuance of their own special interests, transformed themselves from the servants of society into the masters of society."¹

Elsewhere, Engels points out that "society gives rise to certain common functions which it cannot dispense with. The persons appointed for this purpose form a new branch of the division of labour *within society*. This gives them particular interests, distinct, too, from the interests of those who empowered them; they make themselves independent of the latter, and the state is in being."²

What does Engels mean? Does his passage really conflict with the Marxist conception of the class nature of the bourgeois state? Of course, not. It is aimed against the notion that the state is an extraneous body imposed on society. The emergence and existence of the state is objectively necessary. A parasite, it lives off the objectively existing social need for it.

The various bodies of state appear originally as part of the division of labour in society. It is quite obvious, for example, that a special stratum of armed men appeared in the primitive community not only because the governing group had to keep the rest of the tribe or community under control by extra-economic means. These armed men performed other functions required by society, such as, say, defence from enemy attacks, maintenance of public order, the laws, customs, etc. But these functions are performed by the state to the extent best suited economically to the governing classes, the classes in control of the state. When victorious in a war, the state does not give the fruits of victory to the

¹ Marx, Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, p. 483.

² Marx, Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, Moscow, p. 503.

exploited, but to the governing class. The state maintains public order seemingly in the interests of society as a whole, but really because the class in power requires it.

In modern developed capitalist society there is a distinct need for the state to intervene in economic relations. This objective need is served by nationalisation of some of the branches of economy and by the growth of state-operated industry. The bureaucracy has naturally grown. This vast machinery, with its own hierarchy, its own standards of behaviour, has a discipline of its own and a range of privileges.

It is quite safe to say that this numerous section of the population acquires some special interests. They are interests of the caste of officials, many of whom belong to the capitalist class. All in all, these interests coincide with those of the capitalist class. The caste of officials, whose very existence depends on the existing system, is naturally sure to serve this system heart and soul. It has its own specific interests, but these, too, coincide with the interests of some sections of capitalists. The industrial bureaucracy employed at state-owned enterprises is eager to see these enterprises, and the whole state-operated economic sector, expand. This desire clashes with the interests of some monopoly alliances, precipitating certain antagonisms. But these antagonisms operate *within* the governing class. Whenever the interests of this class have to be protected from the working people, the bureaucracy and the capitalists stand together.

A certain degree of "independence" is exercised by the bourgeois state and its machinery in social legislation. In the last few decades the workers in some West European countries and the United States have won more or less tangible concessions from the bourgeoisie. As a rule, these are legally enacted. At times, at least on the face of it, such legislation may even injure the monopolies, which are made to discharge certain obligations to the workers. But this does not mean that the bourgeois state serves the monopolies and the workers equally. All it means is that the imperialist governments dread the growing working-class and liberative movement, and are more provident and far-sighted than individual capitalists are. Wishing to preserve the whole, they are inclined to sacrifice a portion, at least when the economic situation is favourable. The bureaucracy, which loses noth-

ing from it, is easier persuaded to enact a law that may be somewhat detrimental to the capitalists.

It does not follow, however, that the bureaucracy is an intermediate force. To be such a force, it would have to be equally prepared to protect the existing forms of property and social system in the interests of the monopolies, on the one hand, and to effect the transition to collective forms of property, to the socialist system, in the interests of the workers, on the other. Such "impartiality" is conspicuous by its absence in, say, the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany, and in all the other capitalist countries with a highly developed bureaucracy. On the contrary, the bourgeois state goes out of its way to protect private property and uphold all the pertinent laws and regulations by all the means at its disposal, whether economic or non-economic.

The economic function of the bourgeois state, we see, is really a response to the objective need implicit in the high level of production. But it is performed in the interests of the monopolies, of the capitalist class as a whole. It is wrong to say, therefore, that the state is independent of the classes locked in struggle.

Marx and Engels wrote that in some situations the state may, to some extent, act as an independent force and manoeuvre between the antagonistic classes. "The independence of the State," they wrote, "is only found nowadays in those countries where the estates have not yet completely developed into classes, where the estates, done away with in more advanced countries, still have a part to play, and where there exists a mixture; countries, that is to say, in which no one section of the population can achieve dominance over the others."¹

In our time, a certain amount of independence on the part of states with respect to the different classes may still be observed in some of the newly formed African and Asian countries, where class relations have not yet become as acute as in the developed capitalist countries, and where the state tries to sit on the fence between the different sections of the population. But to attribute anything of the kind to the imperialist states is to go against the facts.

¹ Marx, Engels, *The German Ideology*, Moscow, 1964, p. 78.

THE WORKING CLASS FIGHTS FOR DEMOCRACY AND SOCIALISM

What the Right Socialists and revisionists want is to instil the notion, covertly or overtly, that the Marxist-Leninist theory on the revolutionary overthrow of bourgeois power is outdated. Modern capitalism, they say, is so much unlike the capitalism of Lenin's, let alone Marx's time, that the Marxist-Leninist theory of revolution should be scrapped. Instead, they suggest the outworn, shabby idea of the gradual and spontaneous growth of capitalism into socialism.

The lessons of history give the lie to this reformist notion. They show clearly that socialist revolution is the only way to achieve the new socialist system. They show, moreover, that socialist revolution is in our time an objective necessity. Acting on the Marx and Lenin theory of socialist revolution, the working class and the masses have under the leadership of the Communist Parties gained power in countries with a total population of more than 1,000 million. The imposing achievements of socialism in the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries is the best possible testimonial the Marxist-Leninist theory can have.

As for the dogmatists, they are blind to the new element the contemporary epoch has brought into the theory of scientific socialism. The dogmatists admit that the last few decades have witnessed far-reaching changes in the world, but cannot be bothered to draw the relevant conclusions. They cast doubt on the new propositions in the theory and tactics of socialist revolution worked out by the communist movement in recent years. They refuse to heed Marx and Lenin, who called for a creative approach to the theory of scientific socialism. Lenin was a theorist of genius and a brilliant exponent of revolution. Anyone who wants to follow Lenin must realise that practice, the experience of the millions, is the chief criterion of theory. Lenin always ridiculed the doctrinaires, the bookworms and text-jugglers. He called on Communists to mind the essence of Marxism and to proceed from a concrete Marxist analysis of the concrete situation.

All the basic Marxist-Leninist postulates concerning revolution are valid today. That is incontestable. But it is equally clear that in view of the changes in the world today they have to be developed. The decisions of the 20th and 21st

congresses of the C.P.S.U., the programme documents of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the socialist countries, and of the countries of Western Europe, Asia and Latin America have done just that. The collective experience of the world communist movement is summed up in the Declaration of the 1957 Meeting of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the Socialist Countries in Moscow, and in the Statement of the 1960 Moscow Meeting.

This immense creative work of the Marxist-Leninist Parties is reflected in the new Programme passed by the 22nd Congress of the Soviet Communist Party.

It is not our purpose to outline the theory of socialist revolution. That is a subject in its own right. But let us at least examine the propositions of the Programme on this score, for they are associated directly with the working-class struggle against the bourgeois state for the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

To begin with, let us deal with the struggle for democracy waged by the working class in the capitalist countries, this being a most important factor of the struggle for socialism.

The Communists there act as the most consistent, the best organised and the most vigorous force working for democracy. This does not contradict their theory, designed to attain the victory of socialism and of socialist democracy. "It would be a radical mistake to think," Lenin wrote, "that the struggle for democracy was capable of diverting the proletariat from the socialist revolution or of hiding, overshadowing it, etc."¹

Whenever the working people face a choice between socialist and bourgeois democracy (during, say, socialist revolution), they naturally prefer their own, socialist democracy. But when faced with the choice between fascism and bourgeois democracy, they fight for the latter, because the difference between them is as great as between the executioner's axe and a court jury. Bourgeois democracy offers the working class incomparably greater opportunities to organise itself in the struggle for its immediate and ultimate goals.

"Democracy," Lenin wrote, "is of enormous importance to the working class in its struggle against the capitalists for its emancipation."²

¹ Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 144.

² Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, Part 1, p. 302.

The Communists differentiate between the forms and methods of democracy in capitalist countries that promote the requirements of bourgeois political domination, on the one hand, and the rights and freedoms gained by the working people in their hard and drawn-out struggle, on the other. Freedom of the press, assembly, demonstrations, strikes, political and professional bodies, certain concessions in the sphere of social relations gained from the bourgeoisie and legislatively recorded, come under the head of rights. These rights and freedoms—mostly curtailed and all too often merely formal—are not to be taken for granted. On the contrary, monopoly capital is taking great pains to repeal them. Wherever they have already been scrapped, the Communists work, first and foremost, for their restoration, and wherever they exist they fight to preserve and extend them.

But that is not all the Communists want. Monopoly capital, as a rule, gravitates towards fascist and authoritarian forms of government. It retains its positions of command in economy and politics also under bourgeois democracy. It is wrong to say that monopoly domination and bourgeois democracy are totally incompatible. Imperialism would like to rid itself of bourgeois democracy, but wherever it cannot do so, it exercises its rule through this democracy. In the United States and some other countries candidly dictatorial methods are employed to suppress the progressive forces. Take McCarthyism. But all in all the imperialists maintain bourgeois democracy which, it is true, they have so tailored as to suit the needs of the monopolies.

Furthermore, bourgeois democracy does not offer reliable enough guarantees against evolving into authoritarianism or outright dictatorship. On the contrary, when controlled by the monopolies it gravitates towards just that sort of evolution. The Federal Republic of Germany is an object lesson in that respect, because we see its bourgeois-democratic institutions changing slowly but surely into candidly reactionary, authoritarian institutions.

Last but not least, bourgeois democracy will not meet the democratic demands of the bulk of the people. Peace, national independence and sovereignty, an agrarian reform in the interests of the labouring peasants, guaranteed employment for the workers, delivery of the intellectuals from spiritual enthrallment by monopoly capital, and emancipation

of women—all these are democratic demands. But to meet them a new democracy is wanted, one capable of defending the interests of the people. For this reason, the Communists work not only for the preservation, but also for the renovation of democracy. They work for democratic government, which, backed by the masses, would effect a broad programme of democratic change.

In the modern environment, with the new relation of forces tilting towards socialism and peace, the conditions for the struggle of the democratic forces in the capitalist countries have improved.

As emphasised in the Programme of the C.P.S.U., the working class in many countries is able in the new historical conditions, even before capitalism is overthrown, to impose on the bourgeoisie such measures as would go beyond the bounds of ordinary reform and have a strong bearing on the working class and the development of its struggle for revolution, for socialism. It would also have a strong bearing on the majority of the nations. By bringing together the democratic and peace-loving forces, the working class may compel the governing element to cease its war preparations, to stop provoking local wars, and to utilise the economy for peaceful purposes. If the working class rallies the people, it may repel the offensive of fascist reaction, attain a nationwide programme of peace, national independence and democratic rights, and a certain improvement of the living standard.

The working class aims its main blow at the capitalist monopolies, who are the sworn enemy not only of the workers, but also of the peasants, artisans and other petty proprietors, office employees, intellectuals and even a part of the middle capitalists. The bulk of the nation wants the omnipotence of the monopolies smashed. This is common ground for all the democratic movements opposing the financial oligarchy.

The 1957 Declaration of the Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow pointed to the objective necessity of invigorating the struggle for democracy in the capitalist countries. At the Conference of 17 Communist Parties of Europe, held in Rome in 1939, the problem was developed and set out in an Appeal to All Working People, to All Democrats. The Statement of the 1960 Meeting of Communist

and Workers' Parties emphasised that "it is the prime duty of the working class and its communist vanguard to head the economic and political struggle of the masses for democratic reforms, for the overthrow of the power of the monopolies, and assure its success".¹ The Programme of the C.P.S.U. also took note of this experience of the world communist movement.

The Communists in the capitalist countries advocate and work for broad democracy in all public matters. Such democracy should apply not only to the political sphere—greater rights for parliaments and local administrations, fair election laws, and the like—but also to sweeping nationalisation on terms most advantageous for the people. The proletariat supports the peasantry in its demand for radical agrarian reforms. It marshals the masses for actions against the financial oligarchy, which longs to abolish all democratic freedoms and establish an authoritarian regime.

Regrettably, the anti-monopoly front is considerably weakened by the dissension of the Right-wing leaders of the Socialist and other parties. Their policy is anti-communist, a policy of adapting mass movements to the interests of the governing groups. It is natural, therefore, that Communists lay an accent on uniting all anti-monopoly forces in the struggle for democracy. United action by the working class, the peasants, the intelligentsia and the middle classes would spell defeat for monopoly capital and promote peace and social progress.

Democratic methods will not yet mean that socialism has been achieved. Nor will they mean that the working class has come to power. But they will bring those goals nearer. "General democratic struggles against the monopolies," says the Programme of the C.P.S.U., "do not delay the socialist revolution but bring it nearer. *The struggle for democracy is a component of the struggle for socialism.*"² As we see, in the present epoch democratic and socialist tasks have come closer together and even fused.

The socialist system has a strong influence on the revolutionary struggle of the working class, of all working people,

¹ *The Struggle for Peace, Democracy and Socialism*, Moscow, p. 69.

² *The Road to Communism*, p. 484.

for social emancipation. It also has a strong influence on the forms and methods of this struggle. In our day, the liberative movement of the peoples has new features, due chiefly to the consolidation of the socialist system and the consequent changed relation of forces in the world.

To begin with, all the revolutionary forces have merged in the course of struggle into a powerful, united anti-imperialist movement. "Socialist revolutions, anti-imperialist national liberation revolutions, people's democratic revolutions, broad peasant movements, popular struggles to overthrow fascist and other despotic regimes and general democratic movements against national oppression," the Programme of the C.P.S.U. says, "all these merge in a single world-wide revolutionary process undermining and destroying capitalism."¹

This amalgamation of revolutionary forces multiplies the power of the front opposing capitalism.

Developments in the world today have brought the various revolutionary movements—democratic, socialist and national liberation—*objectively* closer together. They have a common chief enemy—world monopoly capital. The socialist countries promote this objective process of amalgamation of anti-imperialist forces by their powerful support.

The other new feature, also bound up with the mounting influence of the world socialist system, is the emergence of new, extremely versatile forms of revolutionary action. The People's Democracies serve as a model of how people's democratic revolutions, a step towards socialist revolution, are effected.

Previously, bourgeois-democratic revolutions were chiefly anti-feudal. The people's democratic revolutions, on the other hand, are aimed not only against survivals of feudalism, but also against the most reactionary extremist wing of the monopoly bourgeoisie. This creates favourable conditions for the development of democratic revolution into socialist revolution. It brings these two types of revolution closer together.

Last but not least, it should be emphasised that the new relation of forces in the world paves the way to socialist revolution by the least painful method.

The working class in Russia, which made the first social-

¹ *Ibid.*

ist revolution, had to cope with the ferocious resistance of domestic counter-revolutionaries and international reactionaries. For a long time, the Soviet Republic stood alone against the hostile capitalist world. The revolution in Russia therefore involved a sanguinary civil war imposed by domestic and foreign reactionaries. The dictatorship of the proletariat had, as Lenin pointed out, to assume its most severe form.

The subsequent revolutions have been incomparably less painful, mostly because they could depend on powerful support from the U.S.S.R. and the rest of the socialist system. It follows that less painful means of revolution, less painful methods of seizing power and less painful forms of expropriating the bourgeoisie, are quite possible.

The general democratic movements have expanded very greatly, and their tasks have grown in importance. This predetermines the diversity of forms of transition to socialism in the modern epoch. The working-class revolution, based today on broader socio-political alliances than before, will have an overwhelming advantage in strength over the reactionary bourgeoisie within the country. The sphere of violence is sure to be smaller, and the need for violence is sure to be less. This will further a broad democratic unification of forces in support of the proletarian revolution and the new power, and will, among other things, enable the revolutionaries to employ parliamentary forms in the transition to socialism.

So the opportunity of employing different forms of transition to socialism, including the peaceful, does not derive from the imperialist bourgeoisie having allegedly changed its spots and become more tractable, as the revisionists claim. Not at all. It is now possible to build up greatly superior forces and to compel the reactionary bourgeoisie to surrender to the revolutionary masses. Hence, in this case, too, the forms and results of the revolution depend on the existing relation of class forces.

When Marx and Engels presumed that peaceful transition to socialism was possible in Britain and the United States, they pointed to the basic internal factor that distinguished these countries from the continental European countries—the comparative weakness of the British and American militarists and bureaucrats. Moreover, even in those remote days the working class was numerically larger than any other

section of the population of Britain. In those circumstances, a socialist *coup d'état* may not have precipitated violent retaliation by the bourgeoisie. The need for counter-measures by the proletariat would have been obviated.

In the early period of monopoly capitalism, when Britain and the U.S.A. no longer differed from the continental European countries as regards militarism and bureaucracy, a peaceful proletarian revolution there, as Lenin pointed out, became unlikely.

But what about now? Bureaucracy and militarism have developed immensely in most of the imperialist countries. Only some of the smaller capitalist countries in Europe and other continents are relatively unaffected by militarism. Take the economically underdeveloped countries, for example, which follow a policy of non-alignment, neutralism and friendship with the socialist countries. But they are an exception. All in all, growth of militarism and bureaucracy is quite distinct even in some of the economically underdeveloped countries that gravitate towards the imperialist world.

As before, this is a barrier to a peaceful development of revolution.

If Communists had taken no other factor into consideration, one could indeed to some extent doubt the conclusion that peaceful transition is possible. But the Communists also consider other important newly evident factors—the universal weakening of the imperialist system, the acute contradictions between the working class and the bourgeoisie, the contradictions between the monopolies and the bulk of the nation, the mounting revolutionary influence exerted on the capitalist world by the socialist system, etc. In the circumstances the working class and its allies are quite capable of building up superior strength and breaking the resistance of the reactionary elements.

Then the choice of the way of the revolution will essentially depend on the working class itself, and, as Lenin always stressed, the working class prefers to take power peacefully. The peaceful way to socialism has many advantages. Socialist changes are carried out with a minimum of sacrifice, reducing to a minimum, or entirely avoiding, losses to the productive forces. The production machine is taken out of the hands of the capitalist monopolies intact and used at once in the interests of the people.

Needless to say, the possibility of taking power peacefully does not rule out the non-peaceful way of socialist revolution. The Programme of the C.P.S.U. says that in a world where exploiters resort to violence, the working people do not exclude the possibility of having to take power non-peacefully. The degree of violence and the forms of class struggle will depend less on the proletariat than on the resistance to the will of the overwhelming majority of the people by the reactionaries, on the violence the latter resort to at any of the stages of the struggle for socialism. In every country, the method of transition to socialism depends on the specific conditions.

The working-class struggle will be the more successful, the better the working class and its party master all the forms of struggle—peaceful and non-peaceful, parliamentary and non-parliamentary—and the better prepared they will be to replace one form of struggle for another at short notice.

But whatever the circumstances, the overthrow of bourgeois power and the transition from capitalism to socialism, as the Programme of the C.P.S.U. rightly notes, are possible only through revolution, through the substitution of working-class power for the bourgeois machinery of state.

THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT IN OUR TIME

Soviet experience has shown that the peoples are able to achieve socialism only as a result of the socialist revolution and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Programme of the C.P.S.U.

We shall have to mention at least three propositions in the list of important elements which the Programme of the C.P.S.U. has imparted to the teaching on the dictatorship of the proletariat:

1) Summing up of the experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the U.S.S.R. and a more specific definition of the historic framework for its existence;

2) Evidence attesting to the necessity of the dictatorship of the proletariat for the transition to socialism of other countries;

3) Development of Lenin's idea about the possible appearance in modern times of new forms for the state of the transitional type.

Let us examine these propositions.

HISTORICAL NECESSITY OF THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, the dictatorship of the proletariat is today essentially a matter of history, for in the U.S.S.R. the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat has developed into a state of the whole people. But it is by no means a matter of history for the nations that still have to embark on socialism, and also for the People's Democracies, where the dictatorship of the proletariat is still necessary.

It is the business of every nation, of every working-class party, to decide for itself by what means it will effect the

transition to the new society. As for the Soviet Union, it has already passed the stage of social development that all the other peoples still have to pass. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is thus able to draw on the experience of its own and the other socialist countries to furnish an answer to questions of enormous interest to all the peoples of the earth.

Some critics of the Programme of the C.P.S.U. (especially the Right Socialists) infer that the Soviet Communists, who have raised the question of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat turning into a state of the whole people, are casting doubt thereby on the very idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The bourgeois *Österreichische Neue Tageszeitung* of Vienna said in reference to the C.P.S.U. Programme that the "dictatorship of the proletariat has never, and could never be effected" and that the history of mankind proves "not the inevitable victory of Communism, but its impossibility".

The anti-communists have a strange logic. For dozens of years it was farthest from their minds to deny the existence of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the U.S.S.R. On the contrary, they capitalised on the Communists' admission of the class nature of the Soviet state and depicted it as a kind of scarecrow to denigrate the ideals of communism. Yet now they go back on their previous contentions and infer that no such thing as the dictatorship of the proletariat has ever existed.

It is most fitting at this point, after the dictatorship of the proletariat has exhausted its functions in the Soviet land with respect to the country's internal development, to repeat Lenin's words:

"Whoever does not appreciate the necessity of dictatorship by any revolutionary class in order to achieve victory, has understood nothing, or wants to know nothing about the history of revolutions."¹

The Soviet people are legitimately proud that they were the first to establish a dictatorship of the proletariat, whereby they succeeded in building socialist society and are now making good progress towards communism.

¹ Lenin, "The History of the Question of Dictatorship", *Collected Works*, Vol. 31.

There is nothing novel about these assaults on the theory and practice of proletarian dictatorship. The teaching on the dictatorship of the proletariat has always been the pivot in the ideological battles between the Communists and the reformists. We say battles, because they were not petty clashes, not isolated conflicts, and not even a war of attrition. They were battles indeed, hard-fought, long-drawn, and often so ferocious and bitter that the polemist would occasionally end up on different sides of the class barricades. The object of the debate is so important that one can hardly exaggerate it. At the time when Marxism was yet in its cradle, the ideological battles between the different trends of the international working-class movement may, perhaps, have appeared to an indifferent observer as the effect of immoderate zeal and sectarian narrow-mindedness. But today, when the proletariat and communism, its ideology, have in the lifetime of one generation grown into a force exercising a decisive influence on the fate of all mankind, even the indifferent onlooker will appreciate that the Marxist theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat is historically of immense importance and that the acute struggle over it is both natural and unavoidable.

The idea of proletarian dictatorship was first set out by Marx and Engels in the *Communist Manifesto*. While combating the anarchists who preached the theory of "exploding the state", on the one hand, and the Blanquists, who overrated violence and dictatorial methods of revolution, on the other, Marx and Engels demonstrated the necessity for the proletariat to win political power and to employ it for the building of the new society. Power was essential in order to "wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralise all instruments of production in the hands of the state, i.e., of the proletariat organised as the ruling class; and to increase the total of productive forces as rapidly as possible".¹

Subsequently, Marx and Engels postulated that the class struggle leads necessarily to proletarian dictatorship and that this dictatorship constitutes the transition to a society without classes and without a state.

¹ Marx, Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, p. 53.

Lenin embellished on the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat on the strength of the experience gained by the international and Russian labour movement after the death of Marx and Engels. He defended Marx's teaching on the state and the dictatorship of the proletariat from opportunist perversions and worked out the theory of socialism and communism. He emphasised that no man could be a member of the Social-Democratic Party and deny the dictatorship of the proletariat or recognise it in word only. The theory of Marx and Lenin became the groundwork for a far-flung communist movement of the workers of the world.

At the same time, a different trend appeared in the international working-class movement. Referring to "new features" in the development of capitalism and the bourgeois state, the leaders of the Second International sought to revise the Marxist teaching on the dictatorship of the proletariat. For that matter, they rejected it. Instead, they advanced the "idea" of the gradual transformation of bourgeois society into socialist society without revolution and without proletarian dictatorship.

This "idea" has become the groundwork of the reformist or, as it prefers to call itself, the international Social-Democratic movement.

Lenin accused the leaders of the Second International of defection and departure from the Marxist idea of proletarian dictatorship. Fifty years have passed since then. The test of time is the chief test of a theoretical controversy, and the scales have long since tilted in favour of Marx's and Lenin's theory.

The working class, allied with the labouring peasants, has under the leadership of the Communist Party won power in Russia, built socialist society, and is now successfully building communism. The working class, allied with all the working people, has won power in many European and Asian countries by applying Marxist-Leninist theory creatively. The powerful socialist system embraces one-third of mankind, the world-wide army of Communists numbers 42 million, and the communist ideology exercises an immense influence on the spiritual life of mankind. Could there be proof more convincing than this that Lenin was right and that the dictatorship of the proletariat is realistic and viable.

The successes of communism are not fortuitous. They show

that the theoretical conclusion of Marxist-Leninist science about the working class inevitably winning power, is an objective law of social development.

What have the Social-Democrats achieved in this half-century? Have they been able to realise their ideal, which they have for no good reason christened "democratic socialism", in any country of the world? Have they at least tried to begin their reorganisation of society? The answer is no. What is more, they have not even tried. In some countries the Social-Democrats have won in the elections. The Labourites, for example, have headed governments in Britain for three terms. The Social-Democratic Party of Sweden has been the country's governing party since 1932. In Austria, the Socialist Party shared power with the People's Party. But in none of these countries have the Social-Democrats ever carried out any in the least far-reaching economic and political reforms to shake the power of capital. In Britain, the Labourites nationalised the coal and a few other industries that did not yield profit enough to their owners. Yet this had no influence to speak of on labour-capital relations.

It should be borne in mind, too, that the influence the Social-Democrats gained in some countries after the war is largely a side-product of the historic gains made by communism, an upshot of the profound crisis suffered by capitalism and of the smashing defeat suffered by its apologists.

In these circumstances, the bourgeoisie is content to enlist the support of the Right-wing leaders of the Social-Democrats in their struggle against communism. Besides, the facts show that while the communist movement is making fine progress, the Social-Democrats are in a crisis. The membership of the Socialist Parties is shrinking, and their influence on the working class is dropping drastically. This is only natural, because they are departing farther and farther from the proletarian ideology, from Marxism-Leninism.

Why is the dictatorship of the proletariat essential for the transition to socialism? Does the working-class ideal rest on violence? Certainly not. The proletariat is averse to violence. It wants a society that will ultimately dispense with the machinery of state, with class compulsion, with the special instruments of such compulsion. The working class is the most democratic class in history by virtue of its social position. It has no means of production, and

therefore does not, and cannot, strive to exploit other classes. Yet this has always been the main reason why other classes, the classes of exploiters, sought to win political domination.

Speaking in terms of history, the slave-owners, the feudals and the bourgeoisie used the state as a political instrument that helped them exploit the masses. The working class cannot and does not have aims of that sort. What it wants is a better life, a life of plenty, and not for itself alone, but for all working people, for all society.

Some may ask why the proletariat requires dictatorship at a certain stage of history? The answer is obvious. Socialism is not built in an ideal hot-house environment. It materialises by way of revolution from the womb of society, a society racked by class antagonisms. To use a figure of speech, socialism breaks out of the iron embrace of the bourgeois world, and does so through bitter class struggle by the workers and masses against the bourgeoisie and other oppressors.

More, the workers' winning power does not automatically eliminate the exploiter classes and the class struggle. The dictatorship of the proletariat is a continuation of the class struggle by the proletariat which has won and taken political power against the vanquished bourgeoisie, which has neither vanished nor ceased to resist.¹ The bourgeoisie of town and country continues to exist alongside the workers, the labouring peasants and the intelligentsia. In certain conditions, the big landowners, the big merchants and other exploiters continue to exist as well.

How to keep these classes, who are distinctly hostile to the working people, under control? How to realise the people's aspirations for social justice and how to expropriate factories and the land from the bourgeoisie and the landowners? How to expropriate all that by rights belongs to the working people, who created it in the sweat of their brow? Will the bourgeoisie and its henchmen take such expropriation lying down? They will not. The lessons of history in the Soviet Union and in other socialist countries show that the deposed classes invariably resist workers' and peasants' power. The reactionary forces never depart from the

¹ Cf. Lenin, "Foreword to speech: Deception of the People with Slogans of Freedom and Equality", *Collected Works*, Vol. 29.

political scene until they have tried all the possible ways of regaining their "lost paradise".

Let us recall the past. When the Paris workers seized power on March 18, 1871, only one officer was killed and one general was wounded. It had essentially been a bloodless revolution. Yet when the counter-revolutionaries suppressed the Paris Commune they exterminated 30,000 Communards. In the 20th century the bourgeoisie, fighting desperately to safeguard its power, is still more ferocious. The seizure of power in October 1917 in Petrograd involved the minimum of losses, while the civil war started by the counter-revolutionaries caused an incredibly large loss of life among the working people. When the counter-revolutionaries suppressed the revolution in little Finland in 1918, they shot or imprisoned more than 20,000 people.

The same applies to the subsequent period. Hundreds of thousands of Spaniards were killed by the counter-revolutionaries and international reactionaries in 1936-39. Lastly, let us take an example from more recent times. The Hungarian counter-revolutionaries acted with wanton cruelty in 1956. Infuriated crowds of reactionaries lynched in the streets the finest men and women of Hungary, those who had not spared their lives in the struggle for a better life for the working people of Hungary.

What does all this show? It shows that after winning power the working class still encounters resistance, often most ferocious, on the part of the reactionary bourgeoisie and its henchmen. That is why the Communists consider the dictatorship of the proletariat inevitable and necessary during the transition to socialism. Nothing but a strong power that will not hesitate to employ force whenever the resistance of its class enemies compels it to do so, is able to safeguard the gains of the revolution and defend the interests of the people.

It stands to reason, however, that the dictatorship of the proletariat has many more functions than merely protecting the power of the workers and peasants and preventing the deposed classes from regaining the helm of state. The difference between the dictatorship of the proletariat and the previous states is that compulsion with respect to class enemies is not its chief function. It is a state whereby the working people build socialism, that is, radically alter economic,

social and political relations in society and repattern the way of life and the psychology of people. By means of its machinery of state the working class directs far-flung economic, cultural, educational and ideological activities designed to erect a new socialist society. From the first, once revolution is won, it organises and guides the peasants. It attracts the intelligentsia which, at first, is under distinct bourgeois influence, to the building of the new life. In the course of socialist development, due to the deep-going influence exercised by the progressive outlook of the working class, the peasants and intelligentsia line up with it. They come to realise that socialism accords with their vital interests, since it completely eliminates exploitation of man by man. All these classes and strata are closely allied under working-class leadership and build the new society by common effort. Such an alliance is achieved with the help of working-class power, the only power that wishes and can unite the efforts of all working people for the struggle for socialism.

Thus, as we see, the dictatorship of the proletariat is necessary to safeguard the power of the workers and peasants and to prevent the deposed classes from restoring the old order, and also (and this is most important) to build the new socialist society and to unite all the forces that wish to see it triumph, in a close-knit alliance.

THE SUBSTANCE OF THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT

Now let us try to understand the conception of dictatorship of the proletariat. A proper appreciation of it will also help us to understand why a proletarian state develops in due course into a state of the whole people.

Lenin dealt with the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat on many occasions. At different times, depending on the specific situation, he emphasised now one and now another feature of it.

Lenin's statements contain a general definition of working-class power applicable to the entire period of its existence, and definitions, too, of significance for some concrete period, some specific situation. Thus, prior to the conquest of Soviet power, Lenin often emphasised the coercive side of

the dictatorship of the proletariat. After the October Revolution had won and socialist construction took pride of place, Lenin laid stress on the constructive economic role of proletarian dictatorship, and on its socio-political and cultural tasks, while also pointing to the necessity of suppressing the resistance of the reactionary bourgeoisie.

It should also be borne in mind, and Lenin repeated this time and again, that the approach should always be concrete, and the analysis of a concrete situation always specific. That, Lenin pointed out, is the most important principle of Marxism. This should be uppermost in our minds when analysing the conception of the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialist democracy, both of which are most closely associated with practice. Every new major historical gain made by communism, every important change in the relation of class forces between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat should be reflected in the tactics used in the struggle for power, and in the forms and methods by which this power is made to function once it is won. To be sure, the theory of scientific communism is a continuously developing theory. It grows richer and more specific continuously, and is able, therefore, to be an effective instrument in the reorganisation of reality.

The following is rightly considered to be the most exhaustive general definition of working-class political power applicable to the entire period of its existence:

"If we translate the Latin, scientific, historico-philosophical term 'dictatorship of the proletariat' into simpler language, it means just the following:

"Only a definite class, namely, the urban workers and the factory, industrial workers in general, is able to lead the whole mass of the toilers and exploited in the struggle for the overthrow of the yoke of capital, in the process of this overthrow, in the struggle to maintain and consolidate the victory, in the work of creating the new, socialist social system, in the whole struggle for the complete abolition of classes."¹

This definition made by Lenin is the fullest, because it embraces all the main distinctive features of working-class political power at any time of its existence. It contains a reference to the ultimate goal of this power—the building of

¹ Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, Part 2, p. 223.

the new, socialist system, and then the complete abolition of classes—and singles out among the other classes and strata of capitalist society the force that alone is able to lead the struggle for these transformations—the industrial workers—pointing to the method, form and character of the relations between the working class and all the other labouring classes and strata—the method and form of leadership.

The above definition shows clearly that the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat is a logical projection of the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the historical mission of the proletariat—the most revolutionary, organised and disciplined class destined to build a society free from exploitation.

It is also evident from Lenin's definition what an important place the teaching on the dictatorship of the proletariat occupies in the theory of Marxism.

"The chief thing in the doctrine of Marx," Lenin wrote, "is that it brings out the historic role of the proletariat as the builder of socialist society."¹ Lenin emphasised time and again that the teaching on the dictatorship of the proletariat is the main element of Marxism. That is only natural. The one is inconceivable without the other. The historical mission of the working class after the socialist revolution consists in directing the building of socialism and then also of communism. Lenin pointed out that the leadership of the proletariat will, as time goes by, become "increasingly milder".² Some say that the conception of working-class leadership contradicts the principle of democracy. But that is not so. Not just because in a developed bourgeois society the proletariat is either the majority or one of the most numerous and continuously growing classes. Nor is it just because this class is by nature the brother and friend of all working people, a class whose mission it is to liberate itself and society as a whole from oppression. The working class exercises its leadership of the peasantry, of all working people, by way of an enduring alliance with them. That is the main thing. From the hour when the revolution is realised and to the hour when communism triumphs, the working class seeks to base its relations with other working people upon the principles of friendship and co-operation. There is an objective

¹ Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 18, p. 582.

² Lenin, Draft of "On the Tax in Kind", *Collected Works*, Vol. 32.

foundation for it—the desire of all the working people to eradicate all oppression, to develop production and to secure prosperity for the population.

The experience of the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies reveals a tendency towards continuously broader alliances of the various democratic forces. Working-class power is based on such alliances from the very beginning.

In the Soviet Union, the working class first made an alliance with the poorest peasants and with only some of the other non-proletarian categories of working people. In the People's Democracies the alliance embraced the whole peasantry, the petty bourgeoisie in the towns, and all the other democratic forces.

This alliance of all working people is a reliable guarantee of democracy. Working-class power expresses and protects the interests of the majority (after the victory of socialism, when working people comprise the whole of society, it does so in the interests of society as a whole). Genuine majority power is impossible in bourgeois society, which is harassed by conflicting interests and where relations follow the principles of domination and submission, and where the wealth is concentrated in the hands of a small group of monopolies, which exploit the masses, the majority of the nation. The most one can expect in the capitalist environment is bourgeois democracy, that is, power of an exploiting minority over the labouring majority.

Proletarian political power, being power of and for the working people, being power of the majority, is by nature thoroughly democratic.

Therein lies the basic difference between working-class power and the dictatorship of the exploiting classes. The substance of the latter power is not in guiding society, but in ruling the working people, the majority of society. For this reason, bourgeois power can act as a democracy only in form (admittedly, a big advance from monarchism), but its nature, no matter what form it assumes, cannot be democratic.

Yet the concept of proletarian political power, as we have already noted, does not consist entirely in leadership of the labouring classes. It also implies domination over the reactionary bourgeoisie and the suppression of its resistance. That was what Lenin had in mind when he stressed that the teaching on the class struggle applied by Marx to the state and

socialist revolution leads up necessarily to recognition of the political domination, or dictatorship, of the proletariat.¹

Suppose we itemise the components of the dictatorship of the proletariat. We shall see that it contains two principal ideas: *leadership* of the working people by the working class in the building of socialism and working-class *political domination* over the reactionary bourgeoisie.

It should be borne in mind that Lenin always used the word "dictatorship" in reference to the big landowners, the reactionary bourgeoisie and to their henchmen, who resisted the power of the working class. Never did he use it in reference to the labouring sections of society. Dictatorship is not directed against anyone but the reactionary bourgeoisie and its henchmen.² Historically, it is as a rule an increasingly smaller and less numerous section of the bourgeoisie that embarks on outright struggle against working-class power. In some of the developed capitalist countries, the dictatorship will possibly have to be applied only with respect to monopoly capital. There is an intimation of this in, say, the theses of the 15th Congress of the French Communist Party. "The dictatorship of the proletariat," the French Communists note, "is necessary in order to establish genuine democracy for the working people against the monopolies." As you see, the dictatorship of the proletariat, spearheaded as it is against the minority, does not contradict the democratic principle of the power of the majority.

Quite apart from the will of the majority, say some sociologists, democracy presupposes tolerance of the will of the minority, whose interests and opinions it is supposed to take into account. It says in the Programme of the Socialist Party of Austria that "democracy implies political expression through the adoption of majority decisions, but at once requires respect for the rights of the minority".

Is it right to say that democracy presupposes respect for the interests of the minority? Yes, it is quite right to say it, so long as it is applied to interests and opinions arising in the labouring classes, for the principles of democratic centralism call for the participation of all working people in

¹ Cf. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, Part 1, pp. 224, 262, 290, 291, 298.

² Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, Part 1, pp. 476, 481. and elsewhere.

the framing of decisions and for the fulfilment of these decisions by everybody once they are passed. It would be wrong, however, to apply this rule to the resisting reactionary bourgeoisie. The question of the minority, like any other question, has to be put specifically, and not abstractly. It depends on what minority is implied, and on the specific situation.

Lenin wrote that the proletarian state should expropriate the big bourgeoisie and the big landowners, but that the approach to the middle and small peasants should be different. "While suppressing the bourgeoisie and the landowners without mercy, we must attract the petty-bourgeois democrats to our side. When they say that they want to be neutral and have good-neighbour relations with us, we reply: that is just what we want."¹

Lenin even advised flexible measures with regard to the kulaks. "In conclusion, there is one more thing I wanted to remind you of," Lenin said, "is the talk about the rich peasants, the big peasants (about the 'kulaks', to use the Russian word), about such peasants, in other words, that cannot dispense with the use of hired labour. If these peasants do not realise that the collapse of their present mode of production is inevitable and fail to draw the pertinent conclusions, the Marxists can do nothing for them. Our duty is to make their transition to the new mode of production easier."²

The working class in the socialist countries has shown most patient consideration for the sentiments of the peasants. It has made concessions to them, and has compromised with them. Take the decree on the socialisation of land, adopted in the early years of Soviet power. Similar concessions and compromises were made time and again to the intelligentsia and other non-proletarian sections of the working people. What is more, experience in some People's Democracies indicates that class compromises may also be made to that section of the middle bourgeoisie which is loyal to the working-class power.

The reactionary bourgeoisie, which actively resists socialist innovation, is a horse of a different colour. The working class cannot guarantee that it will not apply force against

¹ Lenin, "Conference of Moscow Party Functionaries, November 27, 1918", *Collected Works*, Vol. 28.

² *Ibid.*

the reactionary bourgeoisie. Everything depends on the latter. Any guarantee given beforehand would jeopardise the socialist cause. In substance, it would mean abandoning socialism.

This brings us to the very important question of the attitude of Communists to the use of force in the struggle for the new society.

MARXISM-LENINISM ON VIOLENCE

In spite of what the opportunists may say to the contrary, violence does not spring from the essence of scientific socialism, nor from any of its ideals. "There is no room for violence over people in our ideal," Lenin wrote. "The entire trend of development is towards abolition of coercive domination of one part of society over another."¹

The Communists are working for a society where all violence will be ruled out, where no state with its special machinery of coercion, will exist. The means of struggle chosen by the Communists to achieve their goal accord with this principle. The Communists have always been strongly opposed to individual terrorism, to conspiracies, to military coups and putsches, something the reactionary bourgeoisie often employs in its struggle against the people. Communism has always stood for a broad, truly democratic movement of the masses.

Yet the Communists—and in this lies their basic difference from the reformist parties—think it right to use revolutionary violence and compulsion in the struggle for power and in suppressing the resistance of the overthrown classes once proletarian power is won. The working class is forced to use violence by the behaviour of the reactionaries, who refuse to step off the stage without a fight.

The Communists are not Utopians. They know that you cannot repattern society based on fierce class conflicts and contradictions, and enmeshed in age-old prejudices, by just preaching to it. Therefore, though essentially opposed to violence, they are prepared to use it to the extent the interests and the will of the masses demand. "If we are not anarch-

¹ Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 69.

ists," wrote Lenin, "we must admit that the state, that is, compulsion, is necessary for the transition from capitalism to socialism."¹

When Marx, Engels and Lenin were working out the tactics of the revolutionary working-class movement, they never failed to warn against the two extreme tendencies—the one of underrating the role of violence in the struggle for socialism, and the other of condoning needless violence. It will be recalled that Marx defined the role of violence in revolution as follows: "Force is the midwife of every old society pregnant with a new one. It is itself an economic power."² No definition of the role of violence in social development could be more accurate, more exhaustive and more striking. It contains all the important elements shaping the attitude of the Communists to violence. Violence is recognised in it as a historical necessity in the struggle for the revolutionary transformation of society. It contains a profound appreciation of the fact that violence is an upshot of the insistent economic and social goading to progress. It also contains a clear-cut formulation of the historical limits for the application of violence, and evaluates its possibilities.

A midwife does no more than assist in childbirth. She may help to speed childbirth, to make it less painful, and to safeguard the foetus from injury—in other words, to assist its entry into the world. The most exacting of people cannot require that a midwife do more than that, for it is not she who bears the child nor she who conceived it. The midwife has very little to do with what the infant will be like and, to be sure, even with how childbirth proceeds. This depends most of all on the mother, on her environment during pregnancy, on hereditary factors, etc., etc.

In Marx's figure of speech society with its economic and socio-political structure and its historical traditions is the woman in childbirth. It is society which, availing itself whenever necessary of the services of the "midwife", that is violence, procreates the miracle of socialism.

Marxist theory was shaped largely in struggle against exaggeration of the role and possibilities of violence, compulsion, the political superstructure, and, on the whole, the voli-

¹ Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, Part 1, p. 481.

² Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Moscow, p. 751.

tional element in the process of history. In Marx's day there prevailed the sociological conception that monarchs, heroes, and political leaders were the determining factor of social development—in a word, the activities of the holders of power who supposedly could, at their own discretion, turn historical development whichever way they wished.

In opposing this notion, Marx and Engels developed a materialistic conception of history, whose ultimate core lay in the production and reproduction of reality. Marx and Engels proved that the economy is the basis which determines the superstructure—the political forms of class struggle and its results, the state and the law, the political and philosophical theories, religious beliefs, etc.

"The idea that political acts, grand performances of state, are decisive in history is as old as written history itself," Engels wrote. "Force is only the means, and... the aim is economic advantage. And 'the more fundamental' the aim is than the means used to secure it, the more fundamental in history is the economic side of the relationship than the political side."¹

And Engels added: "Therefore we see absolutely clearly that it is not by any means true that 'the primary must be sought in direct political force and not in any indirect economic power'. On the contrary. For what in fact does the 'primary' in force itself prove to be? Economic power, the disposal of the means of power of large-scale industry."²

It is evident, therefore, that it is wrong to associate Marxism with force, let alone pure force, and to pin on force the hopes of a revolutionary reconstruction of society and the building of a new economic and social system consistent with the interests of the working class and all working people.

Marx and Engels considered the state a powerful weapon for the promotion of the socialist system, but never did they consider state power, and hence force, to be the only means of reconstructing social relations. Engels wrote that "the reaction of the state power upon economic development can be of three kinds: it can run in the same direction, and then development is more rapid; it can oppose the line of development, in which case nowadays it will go to pieces in the long run in every great people; or it can prevent the

¹ Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Moscow, pp. 220-21.

² *Ibid.*, p. 239.

economic development from proceeding along certain lines, and prescribe other lines. This case ultimately reduces itself to one of the two previous ones. But it is obvious that in cases two and three the political power can do great damage to the economic development and cause a great squandering of energy and material."¹

That is the conception of force that underlies the theory and tactics of the revolutionary movement worked out by Marx and Engels. It was uppermost in the work of the Social-Democratic Party of Germany and of some of the other proletarian parties in the European capitalist countries in the 19th century. It was uppermost, too, in the work of the First and the Second International, until the latter fell under the sway of Right opportunism and revisionism.

At the time when pre-monopoly capitalism developed into imperialism, and the time when imperialism expanded, force played a bigger role than in the previous epoch. Imperialism whetted the contradictions of capitalism. Reaction grew stronger in all spheres. Militarism increased. It was only natural that in the circumstances the bourgeoisie would bitterly resist the working class and all working people.

Lenin advanced Marx's theory of socialist revolution and proletarian dictatorship with respect to the imperialist period. He emphasised the necessity of employing force in the conquest of proletarian power and the suppression of bourgeois resistance. This had to be done, too, because reformist and revisionist illusions had become widespread in the working-class movement. Opportunism prevailed in the Second International, and it gradually came to reject the class struggle and socialist revolution.

Lenin proved that force had inevitably to be used against the bourgeoisie to win power, and demonstrated that in those circumstances such forms of class struggle as armed uprising and civil war would be unavoidable.

But even in those difficult historical conditions, while refuting the negation of force in revolution, Lenin said force should not be exaggerated. He objected to force being identified with the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In later days, Lenin emphasised time and again that violence was not the chief feature of proletarian power.

¹ Marx, Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, pp. 503-04.

"As I have had occasion to point out more than once," Lenin said, "the dictatorship of the proletariat is not only the use of force against the exploiters, and not even mainly the use of force. The economic foundation of this use of revolutionary force, the guarantee of its effectiveness and success is the fact that the proletariat represents and creates a higher type of social organisation of labour compared with capitalism. This is the essence. This is the source of the strength and the guarantee of the inevitable complete triumph of communism.

"The feudal organisation of social labour rested on the discipline of the bludgeon, while the toilers, robbed and tyrannised over by a handful of landlords, were utterly ignorant and downtrodden. The capitalist organisation of social labour rested on the discipline of hunger, and, notwithstanding all the progress of bourgeois culture and bourgeois democracy, the vast mass of the toilers in the most advanced, civilised and democratic republics remained an ignorant and downtrodden mass of wage slaves, or oppressed peasants, robbed and tyrannised over by a handful of capitalists. The communist organisation of social labour, the first step towards which is socialism, rests, and will do so more and more as time goes on, on the free and conscious discipline of the toilers themselves who have thrown off the yoke both of the landowners and capitalists."¹

The role of compulsion is different in the various stages of socialist revolution and construction, and in the varying socio-political situations. The extent and forms of compulsion may differ very greatly, depending on how strongly the reactionary bourgeoisie resists. During the struggle for power revolutionary violence may play the decisive role if no other means are available for establishing, consolidating and safeguarding the dictatorship of the proletariat.

That is what happened in the Soviet land, where the Russian bourgeoisie fiercely resisted the working class with the support of international capital. In the fight for the dictatorship of the proletariat the Russian Communists had to abandon the hope of winning power by peaceful means and were compelled to resort to a revolutionary uprising. In view of

¹ Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, Part 2, pp. 222-23.

the capitalist encirclement, violence in the bitter class struggle against the bourgeoisie unavoidably assumed more acute forms than the Communists would have liked. At the time of the foreign military intervention and the Civil War of 1918-20, Soviet power retaliated with what was known as Red terror to the terrorism of the counter-revolutionaries. That was a forced measure. Lenin recalls that after the Revolution Soviet power did not even shut down the bourgeois newspapers. There was no hint of terrorism at that time. Many ministers of Kerensky's bourgeois counter-revolutionary Provisional Government, and the whiteguard General Krasnov, were released from prison. It was only after the exploiters built up their resistance that the socialist state had had to suppress them, and to resort to terrorism. This was counteraction to the counter-revolution, which had merged with the reactionary imperialist forces in an effort to restore the power of the exploiters in Russia.

As soon as the situation permitted, Soviet power changed its methods of suppressing the bourgeoisie. After Denikin, the whiteguard general, was defeated, Soviet power abolished the death penalty although the Civil War was not yet over. "We say that use of force is necessitated by the task of suppressing the exploiters, the landowners and the capitalists," Lenin wrote. "Once this task is fulfilled, we will repeal all extraordinary measures. We have proved this in practice."¹

The situation in the European People's Democracies differed from that in the Soviet land. Drawing on the popular anti-fascist and democratic movement and supported by the Soviet Union, the working class in some of the People's Democracies was able to proceed with the development of socialist revolution in a peaceful environment. It avoided civil war and extraordinary measures of suppressing the bourgeoisie. This proved again that it is not the "nature of communism", but the ferocious resistance of the bourgeoisie that makes the proletariat resort to violence and suppression. This violence, however, is profoundly democratic in nature, because it is impelled by the majority will of the

¹ Lenin, "Report on the Work of the All-Russia Central Executive Committee and the Council of People's Commissars at the First Session of the A.R.C.E.C., February 2, 1920", *Collected Works*, Vol. 30.

nation. The force which the dictatorship of the proletariat employs against the bourgeoisie is the force of the new socialist democracy.

"What does this force lean upon?" Lenin asks, meaning the dictatorship of the proletariat, and answers: "It leans upon the masses. That is the *basic* difference between this new power and all the previous bodies of old power. Those were bodies exercising the power of the minority over the people, over the workers and peasants. The new bodies exercise the power of the people, the workers and peasants, over the minority, over a handful of police bullies, a handful of privileged aristocrats and officials."¹

Like Marx, Lenin repeatedly stressed that leadership in the building of a new society was the main content of the dictatorship of the proletariat. It calls for tremendous economic, organisational, cultural, educational and ideological efforts and envisages continuous cohesion between workers, peasants and the labouring intelligentsia. There is no other way of achieving cohesion, unity and alliance but by persuasion, criticism and self-criticism, and by socialist legality—these being the chief methods of proletarian dictatorship.

The working class does not take power for the purpose of avenging itself upon its exploiters, nor to perpetuate class rule. It takes power to create a better, happier life for all working people. The working class, the peoples do not need political power for its own sake. They want it in order to secure an abundance of material and spiritual benefits for all members of society.

As a rule, the need in class coercion diminishes as socialist construction makes headway. Experience shows, however, that class struggle may grow more acute in certain circumstances—under the influence of international reaction, for example. This was true of Hungary at the time of the 1956 counter-revolutionary putsch, but all in all there is no tendency towards a continual aggravation of class struggle in the period of socialist construction.

¹ Lenin, "The History of the Question of Dictatorship", *Collected Works*, Vol. 31.

MARXISM-LENINISM AND THE PERSONALITY CULT ARE INCOMPATIBLE

The documents of the C.P.S.U. reveal the connection that existed between the perversions of socialist legality at the time of the Stalin cult and the incorrect views that prevailed then in relation to a number of important points of Marxist-Leninist theory.

It is essential that we go back to the errors and perversions of the personality cult, because some people in the communist movement still fail to see the immense danger they presented to socialism. On the other hand, undisguised enemies of communism are trying to capitalise on the personality cult in order to discredit communist ideas among the working people in the capitalist countries.

What was Stalin's chief mistake in socialist construction and in defining the role of the state? He exaggerated the role of force, coming forward with the wrong assumption that class struggle grows more acute as the transition to socialism follows its course.

This theory served to justify mass arrests of prominent Party and government leaders and many other guiltless people, both members and non-members of the Communist Party. Stalin ridiculed the men who said people should be treated with care and mercy, and recommended looking for saboteurs among those "possessing a Party ticket".

Stalin's proposition on the sharpening of class struggle was bound up with his views on the state as formulated at the 18th Party Congress. What he said was meant to justify an emphasis on coercive methods during the transition to communism and to vindicate the widespread violations of socialist legality. It was a time, however, when socialism already held sway and no ground was left within the country for any aggravation of the class struggle. As a matter of fact, the stage was set for a further advancement of socialist democracy, as defined in the 1936 Constitution.

Note the way Stalin put the question. He said the reason he was raising the issue of the state at the Party Congress was the prevailing "underestimation of the role and importance of our socialist state and its military, punitive and

intelligence agencies". This instead of the fact that the building of socialism had been completed in the country and that in this connection the political system had to be improved. The matter was thus put on its head. Objectively, the time had come to develop socialist democracy, while Stalin focused attention on the organs of compulsion. (It stands to reason that we do not here refer to measures designed to reinforce the country's security, which were necessary.)

Stalin also overrated force in his contention that in the first phase of development of the Soviet state, until the time when the exploiting classes are abolished completely, the economic and cultural functions of the bodies of state "do not develop in any way seriously". Actually, the day after the October Revolution Lenin mapped out a prodigious programme of economic development and of a socialist reorganisation of social relations. Lenin's plans were reflected in such works as his *The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government* (April 1918)¹, etc., in the Soviet laws, and in the entire practice of the Soviet state. The Civil War started by the counter-revolutionaries put a halt to these plans. But after the war was over the Party and the state tackled economic development with redoubled energy. So, when Stalin minimised the economic and cultural role of the Soviet state during the period of socialist construction, and did so after socialism had already been built, he transgressed not only against Lenin's precepts, but also against the practical mission of the Party, at whose head he then stood.

When comparing the functions of the proletarian state in the first phase of its development with those of bourgeois states, Stalin laid emphasis in his report to the 18th Congress on functions directly associated with violence and compulsion. Yet if one is to dwell on the features which the socialist state inherited from preceding political forms and institutions (on an entirely different class foundation, of course), one should primarily single out the democratic revolutionary traditions that sprang up at the time of the great bourgeois democratic revolutions.

The socialist state is a new and superior type of democracy. But it should be borne in mind all the same that it

¹ See Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, Part 1, p. 448.

borrowed some revolutionary democratic principles, such as freedom, equality, democracy, universal suffrage, the right to unions, freedom of the press, etc., from previous political forms. It imparts a new socialist content to them, and presses for their realisation.

As Lenin said, the accent shifts to guarantees of political rights and freedoms. When the first constitutions, codes and other important legislative acts were being drawn up, Lenin advised the authors to examine the system and work of the institutions of bourgeois democracy in order to use their best democratic features in Soviet state development. It is therefore the democratic institutions, principles and offices proclaimed during the bourgeois-democratic revolutions, though not carried through to the finish in the capitalist environment, that provide a link with the past.

To be sure, the socialist state cannot afford to ignore the existence of imperialist states. The class struggle between socialism and capitalism will go on until the day when socialism triumphs throughout the world. This does not mean, however, that the socialist state should employ the same methods as the imperialist states. The methods of struggle for socialism and communism, like the goals of that struggle, are imbued with the ideals of proletarian humanity and socialist democracy.

Stalin's mistake was not that he advocated the use of violence in the struggle for new society. All Marxists-Leninists recognise compulsion, whenever it is necessary, in relation to the class enemies of the proletariat. That is the main difference between the Communists and the reformists. The struggle for socialism in the Soviet Union and in the other socialist countries has shown clearly that the reconstruction of society along socialist lines unavoidably involves violence.

But other things have to be borne in mind as well—the role, the objective content, the scale and the forms of compulsion are bound to change as the social conditions change. It is one thing for the socialist state to employ methods of compulsion at the time of civil war against its class enemies, who operate with arms against the new system, and to employ economic and other forms of compulsion against the exploiting classes and their remnants during the transitional

period from capitalism to socialism. And it is quite another thing to do so after socialism wins, the exploiting classes are abolished, and society consists of friendly classes—the workers, the peasants, and the intelligentsia. Compulsion aimed against entire classes, against their organisations, gradually sheds its class complexion in the socialist environment. It does not act against any of the classes, but against specific violations of the law and of the standards maintained by the socialist state. This means that the forms, methods and proportions of the state's coercive actions change accordingly.

The violations of revolutionary legality and the wholesale repressions of the personality cult period were intolerable. They were in conflict with the prevailing social conditions and with the objective social requirements. Let us recall Lenin's statement that force is needed only to suppress the resistance of the exploiters, and that when this resistance is broken its role dwindles to nought. The main thing is to convince and educate the masses. The main thing is for the masses to work creatively and build a new life. After socialism is built, during the transition to communism, the methods of conviction and education are decisive, and make compulsion unnecessary.

It is wrong to think that the successes of socialist construction in the Soviet land were achieved through compulsion. Quite the contrary. The violence of the Stalin cult period was a brake on the progress of Soviet society. The main thing was the mass enthusiasm engendered by the revolution, the deep faith of the people in socialist and communist ideals, the devotion of hundreds of thousands of Communists who did not stint their strength, even their lives, and dedicated themselves completely to the building of the new society, the development of socialist relations of production. This is what accelerated the process of history. This is what enabled the country to achieve rapid successes in the building of socialism in spite of the personality cult.

Only people who have no faith in the masses, who regard the masses as nothing but blind muscle, could think that communism is built by compulsion. Though they may think they are "blessing" the masses thereby, their methods would yield the very reverse results. Communism is the business of the people itself, led by the Party, and must win the

minds of every man, woman and child and alter their psychology. As Lenin wrote, democracy is essential in order to "advance according to plan, firmly and perseveringly, to socialism, not 'establishing' it from above, but elevating the masses of proletarians and semi-proletarians to the art of government, to the administration of *all* state power".¹

The 22nd Congress of the C.P.S.U. presented a profound analysis of the origins and causes of the personality cult in the U.S.S.R. It demonstrated that the personality cult is deeply alien to the nature of the Soviet state, and of socialism. The cult sprang up in the Soviet Union not because capitalist ways were re-introduced in any form, but in spite of the Soviet socio-political system. Its appearance is related to the negative qualities of Stalin, to which Lenin had called attention shortly before his death.

The personality cult was to some extent also due to the difficult domestic and international situation. The Soviet people built socialism in a hostile capitalist encirclement, continuously threatened by attack from without. They built socialism in a country that was economically, technically and culturally backward. The victorious workers and peasants had no skills of government and no experience in the building of the new society. These factors were bound to complicate the struggle against excessive bureaucracy.

Bureaucracy is not by nature typical of the workers' and peasants' state. The latter is established by the working people, serves the working people, and is controlled by them. But even after winning power the proletariat is compelled to battle bureaucratic tendencies for some time. These tendencies are a survival of the capitalist system.

It should also be borne in mind that in the period of transition from capitalism to socialism bureaucracy feeds on the backwardness of the petty-bourgeois section of the population. Yet the deeply democratic nature of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the power of the majority of the nation, has all the requisites to combat bureaucratic tendencies in all spheres of national life.

Lenin waged a resolute, indeed a ferocious war against all signs of bureaucracy. He warned the Party continuously against its evils, especially after the Civil War, when favour-

¹ Lenin, "The Proletarian Militia", *Collected Works*, Vol. 24.

able conditions appeared for a broad development of proletarian democracy and for a determined offensive against the bureaucratic trends left over from capitalism. "*We must get rid of this enemy*," Lenin said, "*and we shall get rid of it with the help of all the politically conscious workers and peasants.*"¹

Lenin attached immense importance to the improvement of the machinery of state. In his latter works he wrote:

"We, too, lack sufficient civilisation to enable us to pass straight on to socialism, although we have the political requisites for this. We must adopt the following tactics, or pursue the following policy to save ourselves.

"We must strive to build up a state in which the workers retain their leadership in relation to the peasants, in which they retain the confidence of the peasants, and, by exercising the greatest economy, remove every trace of extravagance from our social relations.

"We must reduce our state apparatus to the utmost degree of economy. We must remove from it all traces of extravagance, of which so much has been left over from tsarist Russia, from its bureaucratic capitalist apparatus. . . . Only by combing out our government offices to the utmost, by cutting out everything that is not absolutely essential, shall we be certain of holding on. If we do that we shall be able to hold on, not on the level of a small-peasant country, not on the level of this universal narrowness, but on the ever rising level of large-scale machine industry."²

The complicated international and domestic situation in which socialism was built in the Soviet land called for strongly centralised leadership, and this was bound to have an effect on the development of democratic forms. The people made temporary sacrifices quite consciously, because they witnessed fresh successes of the Soviet system every day. In these circumstances, Stalin took advantage of the difficulties of building socialism in the U.S.S.R. to augment his personal power, and this resulted ultimately in the personality cult, which gave rise to very painful consequences. Instead of

¹ Lenin, "The International and Internal Situation in the Soviet Republic", *Collected Works*, Vol. 33.

² Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, Part 2, pp. 750-52.

acting on Lenin's precepts and combating all signs of bureaucracy, Stalin encouraged the spread of bureaucracy, especially in the latter years of his life.

But in spite of these grave developments, the body politic of the Soviet land remained sound in substance and carried through the principles of socialism consistently. The Party, the Soviets, the trade unions, the co-operatives and other public organisations—all the institutions of the Soviet political system—guided the struggle of the people for socialism and communism at all times, in spite of the personality cult. And the successes of this struggle were tangible ones. Nobody can deny today that in economy and culture, and all other fields, the Soviet people attained striking results even at the time of the personality cult. Is that not the best possible evidence that the Soviet political system is genuinely popular and socialist in essence?

The country could not have built up a powerful socialist industry and collectivised agriculture in such short order without the masses supporting the policy of the Communist Party. Nor could it have secured victory in the Second World War, on whose outcome the future of mankind depended so much. The fact that the Soviet Union achieved these immense successes in spite of the personality cult and its negative effects shows that the Soviet social and political system is intrinsically socialist, that it has a giant's strength, that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is strong, and that socialist and communist construction is its main goal.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union exposed the personality cult and the attendant consequences with unparalleled courage on its own initiative. No other party in the world would have dared reveal its mistakes and to take action against them. There is no better proof that the Soviet system is sound and that the great Marxist-Leninist teaching will triumph.

The enemies of socialism gloat over the violations of revolutionary legality committed at the time of the personality cult, of which the speakers at the 22nd Congress of the C.P.S.U. spoke with so much grief and pain. They take pleasure in describing the "terrors of communism". It would do them good to recall that every decade, every year and every

day of bourgeois rule entails incomparably greater suffering for the masses, claiming unheard-of sacrifice and a terrible waste of the productive forces. Is it not true that the bourgeois countries started the bloodiest world wars in history? Ten million people were killed and twenty million were wounded or gassed in the First World War. The toll in lives and wounded exceeded 80 million in the Second World War. The aggregate cost of the Second World War amounted to \$1,384,000 million, or nearly 560 per cent more than in the First. The bourgeoisie bears the onus of blame for the monstrous crimes of the fascists, the crimes committed in the colonies, where the "civilised" plunderers literally exterminated numerous peoples, and for retarding the development of continents by hundreds of years. The bourgeoisie exploits the peoples day in and day out in all the corners of the world where it still rules. The pity expressed by its ideologists, echoed by the reformists, to "victims" in the socialist countries is undisguised hypocrisy. Yes, the Communists bared the ulcers of the personality cult. They did so in order to prevent anything like it from happening again. As for the bourgeoisie, it conceals its ulcers from the people most zealously, because it wants to perpetuate them.

The designs of the anti-communists are clear. They want to scare the masses by saying that every people that establishes the dictatorship of the proletariat is sure to suffer from violations of legality. They hush up the fact that violations of legality were possible in just the exceptionally peculiar situation of the Soviet state, surrounded as it was by capitalist countries, in an environment of feverish strain and great effort.

True, the personality cult and violations of legality were not unavoidable. The enemies of communism go out of their way to conceal the fact that no violations of legality occurred in the U.S.S.R. before and after the Stalin cult. There were no violations of this sort under Lenin, during the bitter struggle with domestic and foreign class enemies. Lenin always called for the strictest observance of revolutionary legality and saw to it that violators of Soviet law, people guilty of illegal arrests, were severely punished.

When he learned that a certain Kotov, a worker, was

taken into custody and kept at the Irkutsk prison without sufficient cause, he telegraphed the Irkutsk authorities. In his telegram, dated December 5, 1921, he wrote:

"Release him at once and institute court proceedings against the people responsible for the arrest, whoever they may be."¹

On learning from a letter by M. Bagayev, a Soviet citizen, that the authorities in Novosibirsk (then Novonikolayevsk) Region exceeded the tax in kind target, Lenin wrote on March 6, 1922: "Punish the culprits for abusing their power when collecting taxes in kind."²

The C.P.S.U. took pains to expose the Stalin cult, and in that lies a guarantee against such mistakes ever happening again.

Measures have been taken to root out the effects of the personality cult in the country's legal machinery. Supervision over the security bodies has been tightened. The criminal code has been appropriately altered, and control by representative bodies and the public over the government apparatus, etc., has been tightened as well.

On the strength of the 20th, 21st and 22nd congress decisions, the Communist Party has extended the activities of all the institutions of socialist democracy and drawn the people into governing the country. The Soviet political system affords ample opportunities for this. We might name strict enforcement of Party standards, regular convention of Party congresses and C.C. plenums, and faithful observance of the provisions of the Constitution of the U.S.S.R. by the Soviets, etc. Socialist democracy, as we see, has been advanced.³

Restoration and development of Lenin's ideas and rectification of the distortions made by the vulgarisers of Marxism-Leninism helped the C.P.S.U. eliminate the harmful consequences of the personality cult in Party and state affairs and chart the development of the state of the whole people during the transition to communism.

¹ *Lenin Miscellany*, XXXV, 1945, p. 299, in Russian.

² *Ibid.*, p. 337.

³ See Chapter Five for a more exhaustive account.

DIVERSITY OF FORMS OF WORKING-CLASS POWER

The ideas set out in the Programme of the C.P.S.U. about the diversity of forms working-class political power may assume and about the factors governing these various forms are of immense interest to countries that still have to make the transition to socialism.

The Programme of the C.P.S.U. has enlarged on Lenin's ideas about the different forms of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The conclusions drawn on this score by the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U., set out and elaborated in the Programme, have a lasting impact. The Programme notes "the possibility and necessity, in a number of countries, of *transition stages* in the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat, and a *variety of forms* of political organisation of the society building socialism."¹

It will be recalled that Lenin, like Marx, stressed that while the substance of the power making the transition to socialism is always the same, its forms and methods may vary, for they reflect the specific features of the country concerned and the contemporary historical circumstances. "All nations will arrive at socialism—this is inevitable," Lenin wrote, "but all will do so in not exactly the same way, each will contribute something of its own to some form of democracy, to some variety of the dictatorship of the proletariat, to the varying rate of socialist transformations in the different aspects of social life."²

The objective trend in the transition of mankind to communism is exemplified by the class substance of working-class power, which is the same in all countries, but the forms and methods of democracy demonstrate the diversity that every people imparts to it in making the transition.

Marxist-Leninist science has summed up historical experience and established the following form of working-class political power: the power of the 1871 Paris Commune type, Soviet power, and People's Democracy. It was Marx and Engels who pointed to the Paris Commune as the first dictatorship of the proletariat. Lenin discovered the Soviets

¹ *The Road to Communism*, pp. 486-87.

² Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, pp. 69-70.

as another form. People's Democracy emerged as one more form after the Second World War, and its features were theoretically elucidated in various decisions of the Communist and Workers' Parties.

The form that working-class political power may assume in a country does not depend entirely on the subjective wishes of the working class. There are objective factors which affect the level of democracy and the methods of government. Lenin analyses these factors in some of his works and helps us to understand the experiences of Soviet power and of the People's Democracies, providing a key to the contemporary situation in the capitalist countries, and to the theory and tactics of the Communist Parties in their struggle for democracy and socialism.

The main factors on which the form of the dictatorship of the proletariat depends are the distribution of class forces in the country, the strength of the allies of the proletariat, the industrial and cultural level of the country in question, whether the revolution takes place in wartime or peacetime, the peaceful or non-peaceful progress of the revolution, the nature of the forms of class struggle (in particular, much depends on whether matters are pushed to the point of civil war), the international situation and the assistance of the other socialist countries, and the historical and national traditions. Of these, the balance of class forces, the width of the front allied with the proletariat, are the key and determinative factors.

The world's first working-class state, the U.S.S.R., had to cope with surviving monarcho-feudal traditions in a country whose development was in the capitalist sense no more than average. The peasants comprised the majority of the population, which was also a salient factor. The Russian proletariat and its ally, the poorest section of the peasants, was opposed by the class of landed proprietors and the bourgeoisie, while the petty bourgeoisie wavered, often gravitating towards counter-revolution.

Russia's working class had to cope with desperate resistance within the country. The counter-revolutionaries were considerably aided by international capital. The dictatorship of the proletariat in the U.S.S.R. emerged during an imperialist war, when militarisation pervaded all sections of society. This was an important factor too. Lenin wrote that

"revolution that follows on and is connected with a war ... is a *particularly severe case of childbirth*".¹

Despite these unfavourable conditions, the world's first dictatorship of the proletariat became a model state of and for the working people, with all the typical features of the higher type democracy.

In its early period, the Soviet power acquired specific features of its own, which stemmed from the circumstances in which it had to operate. To cope with the Civil War started by the domestic counter-revolution with international reactionary support, and with the whiteguard terror, the Soviet power was compelled to respond with Red terror and temporarily to deprive the bourgeoisie of suffrage. This affected some 2 per cent of the population.

Lenin predicted that later revolutions would take place in far less difficult conditions, and would therefore be able to give democracy greater scope from the very beginning. He wrote that wherever the bourgeoisie would not offer the ferocious resistance it did in the Soviet land, the new power would be able to function without the violence to which the imperialists compelled the Soviet Republic. Other countries, he said, may win working-class rule "by different, more humane means".²

Lenin's recommendations to the Communists of the Transcaucasus, where Soviet power triumphed later than in the central areas, are of considerable interest from the point of view of the development of revolution and the forms and methods of future working-class states. Lenin wrote:

"A slower, more cautious, more systematic transition to socialism—this is what is possible and necessary for the republics of the Caucasus as distinct from the R.S.F.S.R. This is what must be understood, and what you must be able to carry out as distinct from our tactics.

"We fought to make the first breach in world capitalism. The breach has been made. We have maintained our positions in a fierce, superhuman, severe, difficult and painfully intense war against the Whites, the Socialist-Revolutionaries³

¹ Lenin, *Marx-Engels-Marxism*, p. 450.

² See Lenin, "Extraordinary Plenary Sitting of the Moscow Soviet of Workers' and Red Army Deputies, April 3, 1919", *Collected Works*, Vol. 29.

³ Socialist-Revolutionaries—Russian petty-bourgeois party which

and the Mensheviks,¹ supported by the Entente,² by its blockade and by its military assistance.

"You, Comrades, Communists of the Caucasus, have no need to force a breach. What you should do is take advantage of the favourable international situation that exists for you in 1921, and learn to build the new with greater caution and more methodically. In 1921, neither Europe nor the world is what it was in 1917 and 1918.

"Do not copy our tactics, but analyse the reasons for their peculiar features, the conditions that gave rise to them, and their results; apply not the letter, but the spirit, the essence, the lessons of the experience of 1917-21."³

Note that Lenin emphasised the two main factors—absence of a civil war and a more favourable international situation.

Lenin's ideas are borne out by the experience of the People's Democracies. The latter embarked on socialism in a much more favourable domestic and international situation than the Soviet Union. The political organisation in the People's Democracies has some common features, stemming essentially from the present stage in the general crisis of capitalism. This makes People's Democracy a new form of proletarian dictatorship. At the same time, the political organisation in each of the People's Democracies has many specific features springing from historic-national traditions.

The fact that the People's Democracies emerged from the liberative movement of the peoples against fascism, the survivals of feudalism (wherever these existed) and against foreign oppression, left an imprint on the form of their state. An anti-fascist democratic front took shape in the course of the struggle. It consisted of the working class,

degenerated into a band of cutthroats, spies and saboteurs working against Soviet power for foreign intelligence services.—*Ed.*

¹ Mensheviks—petty-bourgeois opportunist party which acted as an agent of the bourgeoisie in Russia's working class.—*Ed.*

² The Entente—an imperialist bloc founded early in the 20th century by Britain, France and Russia, and joined by the U.S.A., Japan, Italy and other powers during the First World War. It was formed against Germany and its allies. After the October Socialist Revolution and the Soviet Republic's withdrawal from the war, the Entente launched an armed intervention in Russia, seeking to overthrow Soviet power.—*Ed.*

³ Lenin, *The National-Liberation Movement in the East*, pp. 284-85.

which played the leading role in the revolution from the beginning, all the peasants and, here and there, a section of the middle bourgeoisie. So the transition from the democratic to the socialist stage of the revolution proceeded without a civil war. This is important. It speaks of the class changes that have occurred in the capitalist countries in our time, of the increasing isolation of the monopoly bourgeoisie, and the added number of allies the proletariat can rely on in its socialist revolution.

The existence of the Soviet socialist state, which gave all-round economic and political assistance to the countries in question, was a new factor and had a tremendous influence on the development of the People's Democracies.

Working-class power in the People's Democracies had a broader social basis than existed in the Soviet land during the initial period. This was the main distinctive feature of the dictatorship of the proletariat in these countries. Democracy leaned there not only on the proletarians and semi-proletarians, but on the entire urban and rural petty bourgeoisie, and the bulk of the intelligentsia. What was more, the national bourgeoisie (except that part of it which fought against the new power with arms in hand) was also granted political rights, with some of its parties continuing to function. Yet, naturally, the leading role belonged to the working class and to its party, the most revolutionary force and the most consistent champion of democracy and socialism.

Thus, the experience of the People's Democracies corroborated Lenin's idea that conditions for the development of democratic forms of working-class power would become more favourable with the passage of time.

The Western Social-Democrats say that the dictatorship of the proletariat is practicable in none but countries lacking stable democratic traditions. Even some Left Socialists, who do not deny the immense impact of the socialist revolutions, hold this point of view.

Yet it is incorrect. The monopoly bourgeoisie in the developed capitalist countries is much stronger, much better organised and much more experienced than, say, the bourgeoisie of Russia or China was. What reason is there to hope, therefore, that it will voluntarily submit to working-class power, that it will be more pliable and soft? It is more logical to assume that it will resort to all possible means

-political, ideological and military-when its rule and property are jeopardised.

To be sure, the growing might of the world socialist camp is already exerting a marked influence on the attitude of the bourgeoisie and may subsequently make it more pliable. But it is quite certain that the working class will need force, will need state power capable of keeping the reactionaries at bay, and of suppressing their resistance if they take action. Consequently, the Western countries, too, will need the dictatorship of the proletariat for socialism to win. For how long they will need it, what forms it will assume, what methods of struggle it will use and what policies and stages it will have, is another matter. Marxism has never committed itself on this score, never relying completely on any universal precepts supposedly applicable to any and all historical conditions and to all peoples.

The contemporary non-socialist world is a gaudy one. Only a small part of its population lives in the highly developed capitalist countries, such as the U.S.A., Britain, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, and Italy. Furthermore, those countries, too, differ greatly in economic development, concentration of capital, the forms and methods whereby the state intervenes in the economy, national traditions, particularly as regards democratic institutions, the living standard and, lastly, the intensity and impact of the working-class and democratic movement.

The other capitalist countries have widely different socio-political and economic levels. Take India with its poorly developed economy and the survivals of very peculiar semi-feudal relations, and with its moderately progressive democratic system. Then take the Latin American countries, which have gone a relatively long way in their capitalist development, but in the specific capacity of semi-colonial dependents of the U.S. monopolies. Then there is Africa, the just awakened giant, which still bears the scars of recent slavery, a continent of immense potentialities and a painful heritage of illiteracy, poverty and disease. Yet in spite of their identical social systems, there is a tangle of problems in each country that call for a specific use, on the basis of concrete analysis of concrete situations, of the common regularities discovered by Marxism.

It is futile, therefore, to attempt to predict the specific forms

of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the various countries. All we should like to do, on the strength of some of Lenin's precepts and of the Programme of the C.P.S.U., is to name a few factors that are sure to influence the forms and methods of working-class power in the more developed capitalist countries.

It may be safely assumed that the distribution of class forces will be more favourable than in the previous revolutions and that socialist democracy will have still broader scope from the very beginning. There is every reason to think so, because the classes in the capitalist countries have broken up into more sections than before due to the development of state-monopoly capitalism and the isolation of the shrinking oligarchy group of monopolists opposed to the people.

The offensive of monopoly capital on traditional political institutions, an obvious tendency to establish authoritarian regimes and bend the state to the will of the monopolies—all this leads to a unification of forces on the other pole. The struggle to develop and renovate democracy, to restrict and, subsequently, eliminate monopoly power, is the common goal of the workers, peasants, and middle strata in the towns.

The relatively developed working-class movement and existing democratic traditions are bound to affect the forms of working-class power. All capitalist countries without exception have Communist Parties or groups, a more or less developed trade union movement and petty-bourgeois democratic organisations.

The consolidation of the system of socialist countries is exercising a tremendous revolutionising influence on social affairs all over the world, and on the ways and forms of transition to socialism. Socialist successes in economy and culture, the rising socialist living standard, and the democracy and freedom in the socialist countries are winning the minds of millions of people in the capitalist countries. This adds to the number of working-class allies in every capitalist country, and therefore improves the chances of using democratic methods more extensively.

Furthermore, the growing might and prestige of the socialist community act as a deterrent of possible interference by the international reactionaries in the revolutionary movement of the peoples in the various capitalist countries.

The possibility of preventing world wars in the contemporary epoch may create a new historical situation for the transition to socialism. Until now, socialist revolutions were connected with world wars, which caused world-wide crises, "economic, political, national and international".¹ This expedited revolution, yet affected the forms and methods of class struggle, and hence the activities of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Transition to socialism in peacetime, in an environment of peaceful coexistence, will create more favourable conditions for the development of the democratic aspects of proletarian power.

All these factors give reason to hope that democracy will be more extensive in the coming socialist revolutions and that it will have greater prominence in the forms and methods of working-class power.

Yet we should also note the unfavourable factors. To begin with, the power of monopoly capital has increased to unheard-of proportions, and monopoly capital itself has merged with the state. The machinery of state and the army, the bulwark of the governing class, have expanded immeasurably. Extreme reactionary forms of power have taken root in a number of countries, where Communists and all other progressive elements are persecuted. In many capitalist countries, therefore, the transition to socialism is bound up with general democratic reconstruction, a restoration and renovation of democracy, and restriction of monopolists and the militarists.

Presumably, wherever radical reforms restricting and eliminating monopoly power have been, or will be enacted, the process of socialist revolution and the forms and methods of working-class power will have special features. The ways of expropriating the bourgeoisie will differ, and so will the role of parliamentary institutions. Besides, non-proletarian parties will probably participate in socialist construction under the leadership of the working-class party.

It is very likely, however, that the forms of expropriating the bourgeoisie used in the socialist countries will be employed again. But it is more likely, and the Communists have never denied it, that the bourgeoisie will be paid (in whole or, most probably, in part) for the nationalised means of

¹ Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 299.

production. "It may well be," says the Programme of the C.P.S.U., "that as the forces of socialism grow, the working-class movement gains strength and the positions of capitalism are weakened, there will arise in certain countries a situation in which it will be preferable for the bourgeoisie, as Marx and Lenin foresaw, to agree to the basic means of production being purchased from it and for the proletariat to 'pay off' the bourgeoisie."¹

The Communist Parties in some of the capitalist countries believe that wherever enduring democratic tradition exists, the working class may through class struggle reshape the parliament into an instrument of the working people. It stands to reason, the traditional parliamentary form will then have to assume a new, revolutionary complexion. This deduction is mentioned in the decisions of the 20th and 22nd congresses of the C.P.S.U., the November 1960 Statement of the Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, and in programme documents of the Communist Parties of France, Italy, Britain and other capitalist countries.

The C.P.S.U. Programme says: "The working class, supported by the majority of the people and firmly repelling opportunist elements incapable of renouncing the policy of compromise with the capitalists and landlords, can defeat the reactionary, anti-popular forces, win a solid majority in Parliament, transform it from a tool serving the class interests of the bourgeoisie into an instrument serving the working people."²

Naturally, this is not likely to happen unless the workers and the rest of the working people carry on the class struggle in vigorous fashion against the reactionaries.

It is also possible that in some of the developed capitalist countries there will be more than one political party during the transition to socialism, with the Marxist-Leninist Party holding the lead. Considerable practical experience has been accumulated in this respect in many of the People's Democracies. Palmiro Togliatti, the late General Secretary of the Italian Communist Party, pointed out that this problem has a strong bearing on the West European countries, where political traditions are deep-rooted and parties exist in large

¹ *The Road to Communism*, p. 486.

² *Ibid.*, p. 485.

numbers. In such countries as France, Italy, Belgium, etc., Togliatti said, socialism is a welcome and necessary solution for the bulk of the working people and the middle strata. These masses have parties and traditional bonds with these parties. So the latter are likely to play a positive part in the transition to socialism.¹

But unlike the reformists, the Communists are convinced that the working class must in all circumstances make the revolution and establish a power capable of safeguarding its gains and accomplishing socialist reconstruction.

"However varied the forms of a new, people's state power in the period of socialist construction," says the Programme of the C.P.S.U., "their essence will be the same—*dictatorship of the proletariat*, which represents genuine democracy, democracy for the working people."²

This conclusion is based on the experience of the struggle for socialism in our time.

¹ See *L'Unita*, Jan. 1, 1960.

² *The Road to Communism*, p. 487.

THE STATE OF THE WHOLE PEOPLE

Transition from the Dictatorship of the Proletariat to the State of the Whole People

The state, which arose as a state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, has, in the new, contemporary stage, become a state of the entire people, an organ expressing the interests and will of the people as a whole.

Programme of the C.P.S.U.

To have an idea of the Soviet state of the whole people and the prospects of its development, we need to know at least the following:

- 1) When and how did the proletarian state grow into a state of the whole people?
- 2) What are the distinctive features, tasks and functions of the state of the whole people?
- 3) What kind of political institution is it?
- 4) In what direction does it develop?

THE MAIN STAGES IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SOVIET STATE

Let us take first things first and see how the dictatorship of the proletariat grew into a state of the whole people. The C.C. report "On the Programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union" said that *"the state of the whole people is a new stage in the development of the socialist state, an all-important milestone on the road from socialist statehood to communist public self-government."*

It should be emphasised that a stereotyped approach will not do in determining at what point the proletarian dictatorship grew over into a state of the whole people. It was a gradual and fairly long process, and it would be absurd for us to pick out milestones and demarcation lines, or to name dates. It would be folly to think the proletarian dictatorship

lasted until a certain day and that one fine morning people woke up and found themselves in a state of the whole people. None but a dogmatist would treat history as if it were a cake and could be cut into slices, each slice being numbered and labelled. Need we say that every phenomenon has its roots, its beginning, its development, and its end, and that, as a rule, it does not vanish into thin air, but turns into some new phenomenon.

The same applies to the growing over of the dictatorship of the proletariat into a state of the whole people. It was not a revolutionary leap, because there was no radical break-up. It was rather a gradual development of the one into the other.

To be sure, this transformation is not possible until society attains a certain degree of maturity. The transformation of the dictatorship of the proletariat into the state of the whole people occurs when socialism scores a *complete* and *final* victory and society enters the period of full-scale communist construction. But even then it takes time, and conscious efforts by the people and their party to formalise it not only in substance, but also with respect to the political and judiciary institutions. Like the dictatorship of the proletariat, which changed considerably as it developed, the state of the whole people has its stages, ascending from rung to rung, changing and improving, until it grows completely into communist public self-government.

Mind you, the aforesaid is not to be taken as a denial of the key historical stages in which the development of the state of the whole people proceeds. Such key stages exist, and we shall try and define what they were. In doing so, let us agree on the principle we will employ. Need we prove that the history of the state is bound up with the history of society? Is not the state a social phenomenon?

The changes in the nature, forms and tasks of the state are associated primarily with changes in the class structure, with the rise of economy, culture and the living standard. But those are not the only criteria. Within the framework of social development the state has its own historical milestones. Take the inauguration of a new constitution. It is a milestone, because it defines the basis of a state. But it does not always have to usher in a new stage in the life of society. Class relations (the factor which determines the stages in

social development) may remain unchanged, although a new constitution may have been necessary. This is true of the time when the Soviet Constitution of 1924 was passed, formalising the voluntary union of the equal Soviet Socialist Republics in the U.S.S.R.

When speaking of the development of the state, we should not ignore the subjective factor either. A lot depends on what leaders stand at the helm of the state at any historical period and what methods they employ to carry through its policy. For example, could we ignore the fact that the opening period in the development of the Soviet state (from 1917 to 1924) was associated with Vladimir Lenin? That was when the foundation was laid for the new, socialist type of state, and when its basic principles were formulated.

It appears on the strength of these criteria that the history of the Soviet state may be divided into several basic stages which, in turn, consist of definite phases of development.

The *first stage* began with the victory of the socialist revolution and lasted until the fundamental socialist reconstruction was completed. In this stage, the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat performed all its functions. It embodied the leadership of society by the working class with the object of socialist construction and the suppression of the exploiting classes. Established as a result of the Revolution, it gave democracy to the working people, but was at the same time compelled to restrict democracy—in particular, to withhold suffrage—for the exploiting classes. The working class was given certain prerogatives as regards quotas of representation on the bodies of power, the Soviets, enabling it to exercise leadership of the peasants and other sections of the working people.

The *second stage* began somewhere in the mid-thirties, when socialism scored decisive victories in town and country. The implements and means of production passed into the hands of society, changing its class structure. Landowners, capitalists and kulaks vanished from the scene. Two friendly classes remained—the workers and the peasants—and the intelligentsia, a social stratum.

This altered the tasks and functions of the Soviet state. Once the exploiting classes were eliminated, the state ceased to be an instrument of class suppression. Social and political

conditions arose for the development of the proletarian dictatorship into an organisation of the whole people in socialist society. Proletarian democracy progressively became socialist democracy of the whole people.

The changes wrought at the time in social and political affairs were recorded in the 1936 Constitution of the U.S.S.R. and other political documents issued by the Party and the Government after 1936.

The political foundation of the state—the Soviets—changed. Suffrage restrictions were lifted and the inequality of workers and peasants was erased. Until then, the Soviets had been political bodies of the workers and the poorest peasants. In the second stage, they were renamed Soviets of Working People's Deputies. Accordingly, all citizens were granted equal suffrage.

The social basis of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union expanded. Previously, it had been the vanguard organisation of one class, the proletariat. But as socialist and communist construction proceeded, it turned progressively into the spokesman of all the labouring classes.

However, in spite of the deep-going changes, the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat had not at the time turned into a state of the whole people. Some try to explain this by the fact that the Stalin cult had come on the scene, with disastrous effects for socialist democracy. It is quite true that many democratic forms envisaged in the 1936 Constitution were not put into practice at that time while others were perverted. But this can scarcely be considered the sole reason for proletarian democracy not developing into socialist democracy for the whole people. In addition to this subjective reason, there were also objective ones.

It will be recalled that the Soviet state had to contend with a very complicated international situation. It was surrounded on all sides by hostile capitalist states. A new world war was in the offing, and the imperialist powers were bent on fighting it primarily against the Soviet Union. Besides, socialism had not yet completely gained a foothold in the country. The economy, it is true, had made good headway at the time of the early five-year economic development plans. Industrialisation and collectivisation of farming had been pushed through. But it took many more years to build up a truly modern economic foundation for Soviet society, to

consolidate the social reconstruction in town and country, and to improve the living standard.

The war of 1941-45 against the fascist aggressors, too, affected the development of the Soviet state. It called for centralised leadership, because only a central power could marshal the country's resources for the war effort. Needless to say, many of the democratic forms provided for in the Constitution were impaired during the war.

This is why it took one more stage of development, lasting nearly a quarter of a century after socialism had won in the Soviet Union, for the dictatorship of the proletariat to develop into a state of the whole people. There is every reason to say that the dictatorship of the proletariat continued to exist at that time, although some of its functions changed and the function of suppressing class adversaries became redundant.

This is a specific feature in the development of the Soviet state. It is quite likely that in other socialist countries the growth of the dictatorship of the proletariat into a state of the whole people will take less time than in the U.S.S.R., provided domestic and international conditions are favourable, or even that the process will not occur at all, for the hour of socialist victory will, in effect, coincide with the transformation of proletarian dictatorship into a state of the whole people.

Today, when the socialist camp is a dependable guarantee against the restoration of capitalism in the People's Democracies, the establishment of socialism within those countries will signify its complete and final victory.

In an article in the Czechoslovakian *Rude Pravo*, entitled "Concerning a Few Questions of Transition from Socialism to Communism", which appeared on December 16, 1961, Jan Foitik expressed the opinion that Czechoslovakian society "has attained a degree of maturity as regards social relations that allows for the conclusion that in our country the dictatorship of the proletariat has essentially developed into a state of the whole people and that at present this state, in conformance with its set tasks, is completing the construction of a developed socialist society".

We are not prepared to judge how far the development of the proletarian dictatorship into a state of the whole people has come in the Czechoslovakian Socialist Republic. It is up

to the Czechoslovakian Communists to settle that point. But one thing is clear: the process is far more rapid in Czechoslovakia than it was in the U.S.S.R. Foitik is absolutely right when he says that "this comparatively rapid transformation of the dictatorship of the proletariat into an organisation of the whole people, now in the stage of completion, is based on the domestic conditions of socialist construction, on the one hand, and on the post-war successes of the world revolutionary movement, on the other."

He goes on to say: "It was facilitated by the development of the countries of the socialist community, by their assistance, and above all by the incalculably large material, moral and political assistance we have enjoyed, and still enjoy, from the Soviet Union. The fact that the growing might of the socialist countries will add proportionately to their unity, based on Marxism-Leninism, will stimulate socialist construction in other lands, enabling the dictatorship of the proletariat to perform its chief economic, organisational and educational functions more efficiently and thus develop into a state of broad democracy for all the working people."

But let us go back to the Soviet state. Deep-going changes have taken place in Soviet society since socialist construction was essentially completed in the U.S.S.R. It entered a new stage of development. The beginning of this stage may be traced back to the 20th and 21st congresses of the C.P.S.U. These summed up the results of the development of the U.S.S.R. and recorded the fact that the victory of socialism was final and complete and that the Soviet land had entered the period of full-scale communist construction.

The following features are characteristic of this *new, third stage*: spectacular growth of the country's productive forces and other resources; gradual eradication of distinctions between the various classes, and the formation of a homogeneous working people's society; further coming together of the nations and consolidation of the socio-political and ideological unity of society; greatly improved international position of the Soviet Union conditioned by the emergence of the world socialist system and the advantage gained in the balance of forces by socialism and peace over imperialism and war.

These internal and external developments made the victory of socialism in the Soviet land final. Any restoration of capitalism became inconceivable.

Last but not least, the consequences of the personality cult were removed, democratic standards were restored in Party and state affairs, and the political system was further improved.

As we have said earlier, due to certain objective and subjective reasons the victory of socialism in the Soviet Union did not at once bring about the development of the dictatorship of the proletariat into a state of the whole people. This occurred after the complete and final victory of socialism and the entry of Soviet society into the period of full-scale communist construction. It took deep-going changes at home and in the international position of the U.S.S.R. to alter the nature of the socialist state and to turn proletarian democracy into democracy of the whole people.

In the quarter century since the victory of socialism, important changes have occurred in the country's social development. In 1937 factory and office workers accounted for only 45.7 per cent of the population, while collective farmers and craftsmen in co-operatives accounted for 48.8 per cent. In 1961 factory and office workers comprised as much as 71.8 per cent of the population, while the collective farmers and craftsmen in co-operatives comprised 28 per cent.

The rise in the cultural and technical level, the technological progress as a whole, and the mounting living standard—all these factors are leading up to a gradual eradication of the essential distinctions between mental and manual labour and to greater friendly co-operation between workers, collective farmers, and the intelligentsia.

The differences between classes are becoming more conventional than real, more relative than essential. There is a distinct community among them. Soviet society has no class fences. There are no barriers or restrictions to prevent a citizen going from one social stratum to another. It is often hard to determine what social bracket a person belongs to. A worker innovator, for example, is at once a worker and an intellectual. The demarcation between social groups is becoming less distinct. The various groups are gradually blending into a classless association of people of labour in socialist society.

It is not too much to say that the essential factors have already been achieved for the abolition of classes. No class is in a position to exploit other classes or to seize political

privileges. All the classes have a common socialist ideology, common goals and purposes, shaped by the drive for higher living standards and greater culture, and by the common ideals actuating communist construction. It is this that moulds the social and ideological unity of Soviet people. It is this that makes possible the seemingly paradoxical phenomenon where all the classes and strata of Soviet society have one will.

This does not mean that the guiding role of the working class disappears. It remains, inasmuch as the working class is still the most advanced, the best organised and the most politically conscious class. The working class plays a leading role in production and is associated with the highest form of ownership, that is, public ownership. It is associated with machine industry, and, as we know, machine industry, above all heavy industry, is the basis of economic development and technical progress, without which the transition to the higher labour productivity of communist society is inconceivable. The working class, therefore, exercises a decisive influence on the country's development by virtue, largely, of the objective place it occupies in production.

But that is not all. By now the working class is the most numerous class in the country. From 1940 to 1961 the number of factory and office workers in the U.S.S.R. increased 110 per cent, climbing to a total of 66 million. There is more to this than the quantitative side. In the socialist period the working class has matured spiritually and politically. It has become the true master in production and a leader in all matters.

One of the most important indications is the fact that the working class has developed culturally, acquiring knowledge and improving its proficiency. Forty per cent of the workers have a secondary or university-level education. Nearly 21 million are members of the movement of shock workers and communist work teams. This is a testimonial to their greater culture and their spiritual mould. The working class has the strongest revolutionary traditions and remains, as before, the most consistent bearer of socialist and democratic ideals. This gives it the guiding role in society.

But the working class does not enjoy any special advantages in the formation of the bodies of power and government. Socialist democracy applies to society as a whole, to

all people regardless of their social background. After all, it is not only the workers who have changed and developed, but all other members of society as well. The peasant has changed considerably in the past quarter of a century. The principles of collectivism and socialist relations of production have become part of his psychology. Many farmers are not less skilled and not less proficient than highly skilled workers. The same is true of the Soviet intelligentsia. It has grown considerably in number, and has developed greatly from the standpoint of knowledge, culture and communist awareness. It has contributed immensely to the development of production and to scientific and technological progress. The fact that the Soviet Union has today advanced to the forefront in the scientific and technical revolution is due chiefly, and perhaps decisively, to its scientists, engineers and innovators.

To be sure, in a highly developed society working-class leadership was bound to acquire new features and forms. It is out of the question now that workers should have any privileges at the polls or in nominations to various offices. But working-class leadership is tangible all the same, and felt in all spheres—in the fact that Marxism-Leninism, the working-class ideology, has become the ideology of the whole population; that workers are more often elected to bodies of power and government in spite of the absence of any formal quotas, because they are more active; that it is the workers who always assist the peasants; and that the intelligentsia draws its strength and the ideals for its creative endeavours from daily association with the workers. There are many other factors, inconspicuous at first glance but real all the same. The working class is an example and a model for all the other strata of society. It derives its strength from its moral purity and good organisation. Peasants and intellectuals develop spiritually and become more communist, the more they learn from the good example of the working class.

A FEW MISCONCEPTIONS

The idea of a state of the whole people won sincere and unequivocal support among all Marxists-Leninists, all who cherish the principles of socialist democracy and communist

humanism. It accords with the aspirations of the Soviet people, who are bent on rooting out all the consequences of the Stalin cult on the political scene and on further improving the political system.

This is why the idea is strongly criticised by all sorts of opportunists. People who have not grasped the purport of the development of socialist democracy in the Soviet land, who have not grasped the theoretical background, cling mechanically to outworn formulas.

Some try to prove that proletarian dictatorship should continue to exist until full communism is built. They refer to passages from the classics of Marxism-Leninism, using them without rhyme or reason to suit their ends. For example, they quote the following well-known passage from Marx's *Critique of the Gotha Programme*:

"Between the capitalist and the communist society lies the period of a revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. There corresponds to this also a political transition period in which the state can be nothing but the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat."¹

But let us look closer at this passage. It is evident from what Marx said that he associated the need for proletarian dictatorship with the period of transition that lies between the two formations and lasts until the complete victory of socialism.

It should be borne in mind that the classics of Marxism-Leninism often applied the term "communism" to describe the whole formation that comes to replace capitalism, including socialism. "What is usually called socialism," Lenin explained, "was termed by Marx the 'first' or lower phase of communist society. Insofar as the means of production become common property, the word 'communism' is applicable here, providing we do not forget that this is not full communism."²

When Marx wrote of the need for proletarian dictatorship during the transition from capitalism to communism, he obviously implied the first phase of communist society. Lenin wrote: "The proletarian dictatorship is absolutely indispensable in the transition from capitalism to socialism, and in

¹ Marx, Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, pp. 32-33.

² Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, p. 381.

our revolution this truth has been fully confirmed in practice."¹ Lenin pointed out that it was the purpose of the dictatorship of the proletariat to "build socialism", and repeated after Marx that there would be "an entire period of the dictatorship of the proletariat, as the period of transition from capitalism to socialism."²

This goal has been reached. The transition period lies behind. The internal tasks of the proletarian dictatorship have been resolved.

Some say the dictatorship of the proletariat remains because working-class leadership of society remains. They say that recognition of the guiding role of the working class in Soviet society is equivalent to recognition of the fact that the dictatorship of the proletariat remains. But that is not so.

Does working-class leadership require dictatorship over the peasants and the intelligentsia? It does not. Never has the proletariat imposed dictatorship upon its allies—the working peasants and the democratic intelligentsia. Quite the reverse. It has always rallied them to the building of a new life. The working class imposed its dictatorship solely upon the exploiting classes and their remnants—the landowners and capitalists, and all the parasitic elements of the old system. The dictatorship of the proletariat was necessary to combat class antagonists, to suppress the resistance of the overthrown classes.

It is wrong to identify dictatorship and leadership. The Communist Party led, and now leads, the people in the struggle for socialism and communism. Yet it is absurd to conclude therefrom that the Party is a dictator, as many opponents of communism do. It is just as wrong to consider working-class leadership of the peasants and other sections of society to be a dictatorship. That is wrong with regard to the period of transition to socialism, and doubly wrong today. Why? Because very essential changes have occurred in this period. The farther the eradication of distinctions between workers, peasants and intellectuals proceeds in their relation to production, in their culture and communist awareness, the less becomes the difference between the roles

¹ Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, p. 735.

² Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, Part 2, pp. 209-10.

they play in socio-political affairs. That is only natural. After all, the role of a class in society depends not on subjective wishes, but on its ability to serve the requirements of the system concerned. For this reason, even today, socialist democracy is becoming universal and is spreading to the whole society consisting completely of labouring classes.

The notion that the dictatorship of the proletariat should be retained after completing its functions within Soviet society by reason of the international situation is also wrong. The exponents of this idea refer to the Programme of the C.P.S.U. to substantiate their standpoint. The Programme says the dictatorship of the proletariat is no longer essential from the point of view of the country's internal development. There is no cause to think, however, that the proletarian dictatorship continues to exist from the standpoint of foreign policy. The substance depends on the internal processes of social development, on the internal tasks. It is true that outside functions have a certain bearing on the nature of the state, but they cannot determine its substance. It would be strange indeed if the proletarian dictatorship existed and did not exist, all at one time.

The most important thing is that the state of the whole people performs the international tasks previously performed by the dictatorship of the proletariat with equal success—it works for peace and for the triumph of the principles of peaceful coexistence, renders support to the revolutionary working-class and national liberation movements, and to all the progressives in the world. What is more, this function of the socialist state has a new purport, since the relation of forces in the world today has changed and it is possible to settle the basic problems of our time in the interests of peace, democracy and social progress.

Some said at the time of the public discussion of the C.P.S.U. Programme that the term "state of the whole people" is somewhat stiff. They referred to Marx's and Engels's criticism in *The Critique of the Gotha Programme* of Ferdinand Lassalle's slogan of a people's state. But thereby they confused two entirely different things by virtue of their outward terminological resemblance. To be sure, how could they compare the slogan of a "people's state" advanced by Lassalle in feudal and bourgeois Prussia with the entirely new development,

the state of the whole people, which emerged after the victory of socialism?

Lassalle maintained that the people's state would replace bourgeois democracy and become a weapon in the struggle for socialism. Thereby he rejected the very need of the revolutionary transformation of society. So, Marx's criticism of his position was absolutely correct. Subsequent facts have borne this out. The transition to socialism in the environment of class struggle cannot be effected without the dictatorship of the proletariat. Victory of the state of the whole people is inconceivable without a revolutionary transformation of society and the historical stage of proletarian dictatorship. It is only after the exploiting classes are abolished and socialism is consolidated that the dictatorship of the proletariat turns into a state leaning upon all the classes and all the strata of society.

As for the term itself, it could not have been more precise since it reflects the nature of the Soviet socialist state, no longer the weapon of any one class and a vehicle of the will of the whole people.

Some critics try to refute the idea of a state of the whole people by appealing to the laws of class struggle. But they interpret these laws wrongly. Their arguments are based on Stalin's erroneous contention that the class struggle grows more acute as the successes of socialist construction accumulate. They seek to prove that under socialism, too, in spite of the abolition of exploiting classes, class antagonisms and class struggle persist. They contend that the transition from socialism to communism calls for a revolutionary break-up of social relations. So, they say, the dictatorship of the proletariat remains as a weapon in the struggle of the proletariat against all its adversaries. But who, save the dogmatists, will be satisfied with such "proof"? If class antagonisms survive under socialism, we must determine and clearly define what classes or social groups they affect. Is it the workers and the peasants? Or perhaps the workers and the intelligentsia? Both conjectures are equally wrong.

What the dogmatists say about antagonistic contradictions in socialist society may have grave repercussions if followed up in practice. Nothing but harm to national unity will come of it if relations between classes are aggravated and some groups of the population are either isolated or suppressed.

Some reject the idea of a state of the whole people on the strength of the incorrect thesis that class antagonisms survive under socialism. Others will not hear of it, because they want to maintain their bankrupt conception, according to which the basic functions of the state (economic, etc.) drop away one by one and wither.

Such theorists maintain that the advocates of the idea of a state of the whole people by implication reject the idea that requirements are maturing for the withering away of the state. They go to the length of saying that it is an attempt to perpetuate the state. In their opinion no state is necessary any longer for the building of communism and it is high time to advance to other, non-state forms of life. They identify the withering away of the economic functions of a state with broad decentralisation of economic management.

This is an unrealistic point of view, completely divorced from practice. It does not matter what organisational forms of economic management have been established in this or that socialist country and how the principle of democratic centralism is being carried into reality. That does not determine the trend in the development of the state. Nor is it an indication of its gradual withering away. The state withers away as social conditions ripen for it and socialist democracy develops (elimination of class distinctions, etc.). In other words, it is precisely the transition to a state of the whole people that betokens the gradual withering away of the state.

~~We~~ We shall still come back to the question of the withering away of the state.¹ Let us therefore here confine ourselves to just a few more points.

It is impossible to understand and, indeed, side with men who profess to be true Marxists if they nourish hostile sentiments among the masses towards their state.

In their opinion, it appears, nothing is more important for Communists than to concern themselves with the withering away of the state. Therein, they claim, lies the source of economic success, democratic development and better living conditions for the people. They treat the state with prejudice, considering it an obstacle to these goals, and take

¹ See Chapter Six.

advantage of the people's inbred mistrust of the exploiting states.

For very many centuries the state stood opposed to the workingman. No matter in what sphere a workingman had to deal with the state, it never yielded joy to him and, on the contrary, invariably caused trouble and suffering. The state stood guard over the propertied classes and made the poor man toe the line. The means of compulsion changed. At first there was the bludgeon of the Egyptian overseer, then the sword of the Roman warrior, the lash of the medieval feudal lord, and finally the policeman's truncheon. But that did not make matters more pleasant.

Is it surprising, therefore, that the state is associated in the minds of the oppressed and destitute with violence and parasitism? They always viewed it as a leviathan, a giant monster sucking the lifeblood of the social organism. The oppressed dreamt of destroying this leviathan, and tried many times to tear down the most repulsive of its attributes. Was this not the goal of the Parisians when they destroyed the Bastille? However, every time the hopes of the poor were betrayed. The Bastille was destroyed, but the prisons remained. The revulsion the workingman feels for an exploiting state is understandable. But does this mean that sentiments of the same order are legitimate with respect to a socialist state? Does it mean that mistrust of their state should be cultivated among the masses, rekindling outworn conceptions? After all, has not the nature of the state changed after the people came to power?

When working people come to power, the state changes in substance. It becomes an instrument in the struggle for the common good. It is with the help of the state that the people expropriate the capitalists and landowners and restore historical justice. It is with the help of the state that the people safeguard their gains and build up a modern highly productive socialist economic system. They use the state to secure conditions for steady social progress and for the advancement of every individual. What grounds can the people have, therefore, to look askance at their state and to think, long before the time is ripe, about dropping it? Would it not be wiser for them to concern themselves with its improvement and development, with the elimination of its deficiencies?

There are objective reasons why the state has to be retained during the transition to communism after the dictatorship of the proletariat has fulfilled its historic mission. The fact that the capitalist countries are liable to start a war against the country concerned is one such reason, but not the only one, and probably not even the main one.

The main reason why the state is retained during the transition to communism is bound up with internal social development. The fact is that some of the surviving functions cannot be carried out without the support of a state. "Until the 'higher' phase of communism arrives," wrote Lenin, "the socialists demand the *strictest* control by society and by the state of the measure of labour and the measure of consumption."¹ The Marxist-Leninist classics never said anything about the withering away of the dictatorship of the proletariat. They spoke of the withering away of the state, meaning the state of socialist society. They stressed invariably that this process would be long and gradual. Marx even wrote about the future statehood of communist society, implying statehood in the act of withering away.

Now that Soviet society has in practice begun to build communism, we see how correctly the teachers of the proletariat anticipated developments. It is absolutely essential to have a state in order to afford leadership to economic and cultural construction during the transition to communism, to enforce control over the measure of labour and consumption, and to defend the rights and freedoms of Soviet citizens, socialist legality and socialist property. For society to be able to do it without a state calls for its rising to a new and higher level. It calls for the full victory of communism.

Let us depart for a moment from the theoretical discussion and view the problem in a purely practical light. The state is no abstraction. It is a very tangible concept embodied in concrete forms and institutions and performing its functions through a special group of people. The Soviet state has representative bodies (the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., the Supreme Soviets of the Union Republics, and local Soviets) which in the name of the people handle all the key problems facing the country. It has a ramified machinery to manage the economy, such as economic councils, special

¹ Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, p. 380.

government committees, bodies of economic management working under the auspices of the various Soviets of Working People's Deputies and at industrial and other enterprises. It has security and public safety bodies—the militia, the prosecution, and courts of law; it has an army, security agencies, etc.

Which of these organs are no longer necessary? Which of them could society dispense with, taking their functions upon itself? This specific question calls for a specific reply. Public rather than government forms of administration should indeed be extensively employed now in many spheres, some of them pertaining to economic management, to culture and public control. The salaried government staffs should, indeed, be reduced. The time is ripe for it. But it is also quite certain that society cannot as yet dispense with the services of the machinery of state in any of these spheres, let alone dissolve them *completely*.

At this point we come to the question related to the character, the purpose and the functions of a state of the whole people. Let us deal with it in the next chapter.

THE STATE OF THE WHOLE PEOPLE

ITS FEATURES, TASKS AND FUNCTIONS

The state as an organisation of the entire people will survive until the complete victory of communism. Expressing the will of the people, it must organise the building up of the material and technical basis of communism, and the transformation of socialist relations into communist relations, must exercise control over the measure of work and the measure of consumption, promote the people's welfare, protect the rights and freedoms of Soviet citizens, socialist law and order and socialist property, instil in the people conscious discipline and a communist attitude to labour, guarantee the defence and security of the country, promote fraternal co-operation with the socialist countries, uphold world peace, and maintain normal relations with all countries.

Programme of the C.P.S.U.

The best way to grasp the character, features and tasks of the state of the whole people is to compare it with the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat. We shall then see in better perspective what has changed, and how.

Before we go any further we ought to be clear in our minds that, beyond all question, a deep-going association exists between the state of the whole people and that of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Both of them are states of the socialist type. There is no fence between them. From the day of its inception, the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat contains the features of the state of the whole people, inasmuch as it expresses the will and interests not only of the working class, but also of the working peasants and the working intelligentsia. Its purpose is to effect the socialist reconstruction of society, and its ultimate goal is to set the stage for the transition to communism. It is marked by far-reaching democracy and by developed political institutions typical of the socialist system. For all that, the state of the whole people has a number of distinctive features,

which set it apart from the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

First and foremost, the consolidation of the state of the whole people completes, as it were, the radical *reconstruction of the very nature of the state* begun by the socialist revolution. Its social basis widens still more. The state becomes entirely a body of class unity, an instrument of the will of the whole people.

Second, the *tasks and functions of the state* change. The mission of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat is to build socialism. The state of the whole people faces the immediate task of building communism and effecting the transition to non-governmental forms of life—to public self-administration.

Third, the *methods* of administration change. The dictatorship of the proletariat is an instrument of class struggle within society. Besides methods of persuasion and education it uses methods of class compulsion, methods of dictatorship, against resisting exploiting classes whenever necessary. In contrast, the state of the whole people bases all its activities on democratic education, on persuasion, and although compulsion still exists, it is not applied to any classes or strata of the population as such.

Fourth, *new political institutions and offices* appear in the state of the whole people, and the earlier existing institutions and offices are reorganised. Let us examine these distinctive features of the state of the whole people more closely.

ITS SUBSTANCE AND MAIN FEATURES

To put it briefly, the main feature of the state of the whole people is bound up with the transformation of the social nature of the state.

Need we say that the state is one of the most ancient institutions conceived by the human race. It emerged as a product of irreconcilable class contradictions. It was a machine of political power which took monopoly possession and command of powerful instruments, such as the army, police, courts of law, prisons, and a host of officials. Over the centuries this machinery changed in one way or another. But in exploiting society it has always been, and still is, an organi-

sation of the governing class used for the coercive maintenance of the exploited classes within the framework of a given mode of production (slavery, feudalism, wage labour).

Centuries went by, generations came and went, their living conditions changed. But in spite of the change of classes at the helm of power, in spite of its changing forms, the exploiting state for centuries remained an instrument of class domination and oppression, a machine for suppressing the resistance of the exploited, a parasite tumour on the social body. Such was the state of the slave-owners and of the feudal lords. Such is the state of the capitalists today.

The socialist revolution dealt a crushing blow to the exploiters' state. It broke up and flung overboard the garbage of bourgeois statehood with its irresponsible and privileged officialdom, its red tape and neglect of the people, and replaced it with the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, which exists during the transition to socialism. It differs completely from all the exploiting states, being a machinery of the masses, of the majority of society. But, all the same, it is an instrument of class domination. By means of the state the working class makes the overthrown exploiters toe the line, and suppresses their resistance. In a way, the machinery of state continues to tower above one section of society, the exploiters. The existence of class antagonisms, of class struggle, of relations of domination and subjection within society, still makes an imprint upon all the activities of the state.

The state ceases to be an instrument of class domination only when the means of production pass into the hands of all society, when the economic foundation for the existence of exploiting classes is removed, when these very classes themselves disappear, when complete and final victory is achieved for socialism and when society enters the period of transition to communism. It is then that the state becomes a body of class unity and co-operation, an instrument of society as a whole, promoting its progress, facilitating the final eradication of distinctions between classes, and setting the stage for the withering away of all statehood.

The state of the whole people is the first state in the world with no class struggle to contend with and, hence, with no class domination and no suppression. That is its intrinsic substance, its chief distinctive feature.

People accustomed to thinking in terms of dogmatic formulas consider the very combination of the words "state of the whole people" inconceivable and paradoxical. They say: Marxism has always ridiculed visions of a supra-class state, a state of nation-wide will. Yet now the Communists have themselves come to the point of calling their state a state of the whole people.

In any society split into mutually opposed classes the state is nothing but an instrument of domination used by one group of people against another. But that is true only of a society in which class antagonisms exist. Society in the Soviet Union is of an entirely different type. It has no antagonistic classes and no class struggle. This naturally has a bearing on the character of the power.

The very notion of the "people" has assumed an entirely new content due to the immense social and political changes in Soviet society. The people have performed a socialist revolution. The people built and completed the building of socialism. Today, the people are building the imposing edifice of communism. The people have themselves acquired new qualities and features in the course of their history-making effort. The economic situation of the classes, the social structure of society, the standard of culture and political consciousness, the social outlook, the morals, the way of life and, last but not least, the ideals have changed. Not only have the working-class way of life and working-class ideology become dominant in society. They have also tended to alter the peasant and the intellectual. This has wrought socio-political and ideological unity, paving the way for the appearance of the will of the whole people.

To sum up, the state of the whole people is a *body of the power of the whole people*. The people are its only source of power, its supreme legislator, supreme executive and supreme judge. Its system of bodies of power and government are so patterned as to secure the realisation of the will of the people, the people's participation in government, and genuine democracy.

Bourgeois ideologists criticise communism from the standpoint of their class concept of democracy. For them, democracy is no more than the aggregate of certain formal features reflected in the election law, the methods of forming the government, etc. They gloss over the fact that under

capitalism power is solidly held by the bourgeoisie despite the existing "very fullest" forms of democracy. They gloss over the content of democracy, the situation of the working people, the question of whose interests government policy promotes. That is the sort of yardstick they use to gauge socialist democracy. They pretend not to notice the fact, a fact of truly historical importance, that a new, higher type of democracy, a democracy with new features, has come to replace the old. This democracy gives its due to progressive forms of power, but does not confine itself to just proclaiming them. It puts power into the hands of the people and sees to it that the aspirations of the people are realised.

It is the distinctive feature and advantage of this new type of democracy that it spreads to all the provinces of social relations. Everything about the socialist system is profoundly democratic—the situation of the classes and of the individual, culture, the arts, the way of life, the political principles and institutions, the policy of the state and, in brief, the entire social body and all its main functions, its very nature. Everything conforms to the interests of the people, to their ideals.

Exploiting society with its relations of domination and subjection, exploitation of the majority by the minority, its exploiting state and its laws, emerged on the basis of private ownership of the means of production. Its nature is anti-democratic and anti-popular. Due to the nature of this system, democracy can, in effect, apply to only a restricted section of people, the members of the dominant propertied classes who comprise the minority of the population. The concessions which the masses win in bitter struggles, cannot be other than limited and unstable. As a rule, they apply to political institutions only, and do not spread to social relations.

New social and political relations arise on the basis of socialist property. They are socialist and at once profoundly democratic in nature. The democracy which has served hundreds, thousands or at best tens of thousands of people, is replaced by a democracy of the millions, tens of millions and hundreds of millions. In other words, socialism reinstates the true meaning of democracy.

Along with the principle of true democracy, the concept of the state of the whole people provides for the principles governing the situation of the individual in society. This

applies first and foremost to the principles of *freedom and equality*.

Marx and Lenin always denounced the dodge of the reactionaries to take cover behind slogans of equality and freedom in combating socialism. They revealed the specious character of these slogans in bourgeois society, where they are used to camouflage social inequality and exploitation. At the same time, Marx and Lenin wrote that these slogans were important for the working-class struggle and emphasised that only socialism and communism could realise them. In a society where public ownership is dominant, these ideals are filled with a socialist content and pervade all human relationships. "Real freedom and equality will prevail in the system that the Communists are building and in which there will be no opportunity to enrich oneself at the expense of someone else,"¹ Lenin wrote.

Continuous development of democracy and increasingly full realisation of democratic ideals are typical of socialism, because in socialist society democracy is the condition of social progress and of the all-round development of the individual. Nor is democracy there a forced concession won from the state. It springs from the substance of the system. It keeps pace with economic and social progress and the changes in the class structure of society. As political consciousness and cultural and living standards rise, greater opportunities appear for creative initiative, mass activity, etc.

What did equal rights imply in the past democracies? In slave-owning society they did not spread beyond the small caste of slave-owners. Feudal society, patterned as a hierarchy with a monarch at the head, rejected equality in principle. In a bourgeois democracy, equal rights for all citizens are won by the people in persevering struggle. But in substance they are no more than formal, because of economic and social inequality.

Under socialism, the democratic principle of equality acquires a new content. The economic basis for inequality is torn down. Equal rights, therefore, appear in the relations between classes, between nations, in the new status of the woman, of every workingman. All classes and sections of the population become equal in relation to the state, to the

¹ Lenin, "To the Population", *Collected Works*, Vol. 28.

political authorities, and to the means of production. No privileges exist in socialist society in the political field—the election system and participation in political and public organisations, etc.

There are no insuperable class barriers under socialism. The demarcation lines between classes are relative. Prestige, fame and respect do not depend on the class background of an individual, nor on his family background, but on his own capacity and his labour contribution to the common cause.

The state of the whole people is a *state of the socialist equality of all people*. Material and spiritual blessings are not the privilege of any section of people, and are the prized possession of society as a whole. The policy of the state of the whole people is aimed at the gradual elimination of the existing differences in income that still exist under socialism. Among other things, this is done by extending the funds of public consumption, which are made available to all citizens, irrespective of the quantity and quality of their work.

Material equality is impracticable under socialism. The citizen has an equal right to labour and an equal right to emoluments for work done. As for distribution according to needs, it will not come until communism, a society of abundance, has been built up. But even under socialism there is a tendency to narrow the gap between the top and bottom wages. The present policy in the Soviet Union is to slow up growth of incomes in the high-income bracket and to raise wages in the low-income bracket. This policy is part of the socialist conception of equal rights as a stage along the road to complete communist equality.

Here are a few figures to illustrate the gradual approximation of incomes for various brackets of employees. The average wage of engineers and technicians in 1932 was approximately 160 per cent higher than that of workers. In 1950 it was 70 per cent higher, and only 50 per cent higher in 1959. This is not the result of mechanical reductions in emoluments for one bracket and increases for another, but of the rising productivity of labour, higher workers' skill, the approximation of the work of a skilled labourer to that of a foreman or engineer. The principle of material incentives is, therefore, still valid at the present stage. The matter hinges on the worker's labour becoming more productive.

It has been estimated that an industrial worker doing a mechanised job was 120 times more efficient in 1959 than a worker doing a non-mechanised job. That is the source of higher productivity of labour, on the one hand, and higher incomes, on the other, and will eventually reduce the gap between the various income brackets. Mechanisation and automation offer breathtaking prospects not only for technical progress, but also for the solution of many social problems.

Wages in a socialist economy depend on the quantity and quality of the work done. This is consistent with the principles of socialist equality. But that is not the only criterion. When fixing wages or salaries, economists act on the general principles of social justice. It is self-evident, for example, that the gap between the incomes of the various grades of employees should never be too great. We have mentioned above that the productivity of one worker could be 120 times higher than another's. But, of course, no one would ever think of paying one of them a wage 120 times higher than the other's. Or take the technological novelties. Some inventions yield millions of rubles in profit and savings. But this does not mean that the inventors should be made millionaires. Some novels yield hundreds of thousands of rubles of profit (due to large printings). But it does not follow that their authors should put down their pens and live on the royalties they get from them.

The state of the whole people regulates wages and emoluments most carefully. All citizens should have the means for a prosperous life, but none should accumulate excessive wealth. Otherwise, the very foundations of socialist society would be imperilled, for they would be corroded by alien money-grubbing tendencies.

Bourgeois publicists have been beating the drums lately about their idea of a "welfare state". They are fond of comparing the living standard in the Soviet Union and that in the developed capitalist countries. But they are wide off the mark. We do not deny that the U.S.S.R. has not yet attained the living standard of, say, the United States. It was too far behind in the past, and has had too little time to bridge the gap. But this gap is incomparably smaller today than it was in, say, the twenties or thirties. What is more, soon the Soviet Union will surpass the United States not only in production, but also in the standard of living.

But here is something else. The Western bourgeois writers who extol the capitalist "paradise" with so much enthusiasm, shun the subject of social equality. Could one, indeed, make any fair comparisons of the incomes of the various sections of the population in the capitalist countries? It would be much more counter-position than comparison. In the United States, one per cent of the population owns 60 per cent of the national wealth. In 1961, gross corporation profits added up to \$46,200 million. No bourgeois sociologist would dare compare this figure with the "incomes" of the few million unemployed or the wages of a worker.

Honeyed words about the "welfare state" are not likely to conceal the truth about the social vices of the capitalist system. It is socialism, the state of the whole people, that has tackled the problem of all-round prosperity and social equality in real earnest.

The state of the whole people is *a state of the equality of all the nations of the Soviet Union*. The dictatorship of the proletariat set the stage for the free development of every nation. It saw to it that formerly backward peoples caught up with the more advanced peoples economically and culturally. The state of the whole people has thus become *an organisation of the factual equality of nations*. It represents a new stage in the national relations of the Soviet peoples, for there are no longer relatively advanced and relatively backward peoples among them. Each nation is on the crest of rapid and all-round development. The nations are coming closer together. Their mutual influence and mutual enrichment is increasing. *There is no room, and can be none, for national discord* in a state of the whole people. There is no room in it for national exclusiveness, for any racial or national privileges.

National discord and classification of nations into dominant and subject nations existed in exploiting society for thousands of years. There was contempt for foreigners. Bourgeois democracy never bothered to enforce equality in that respect. Never was it applied to the colonial peoples. Furthermore, in a bourgeois society the governing class always acted on the presumption of the inferiority of some peoples.

Take the attitude towards Negroes in the United States. Even when the bourgeoisie is compelled by the national liberation struggle to grant rights and political independence

to formerly oppressed nations, it never goes farther than merely nominal recognition. It never occurs to the bourgeoisie of the metropolitan countries that it is honour-bound to reimburse the colonial peoples for the immense damage inflicted by its rule and to help them rise to the level of developed countries, to stamp out destitution and hunger.

How vastly this differs from the socialist equality of nations. Equality of nations has been not merely proclaimed in the socialist countries. Every opportunity has been created there for formerly backward peoples to catch up rapidly with the more advanced. In a way, socialist equality of nations really signifies "inequality", but only for a certain time and in the sense that privileges are granted to the backward nations until they catch up with the more advanced. Lenin wrote that "the internationalism of the oppressing or so-called great nation ... must consist not only of the observance of a formal equality of nations, but also of an inequality that would recompense the actually existing inequality at the expense of the oppressing nation, the big nation".¹ It is indeed a fact that the national republics of the U.S.S.R. which were economically backward in the past developed much more rapidly than the more advanced ones.

The state of the whole people is *a state of genuine freedom of the individual*. Not only does it secure the individual's freedoms, such as the traditional freedoms of speech, the press and religion. The individual's rights spread to the political field, to the economy and culture, briefly to all social spheres. In a socialist state where the instruments and means of production are the possession of all working people, the substance of democracy changes quality. Not private proprietors but the people itself administers and manages production and the institutions of culture.

It is a popular dodge of the enemies of Communism to allege absence of the freedom of the individual under socialism. This is a province in which these men have been trying for years to draw a line between communism and the "Western world". But simpletons who believe the fairy-tale about the "free world of capitalism" and the "unfree socialist world" are growing scarcer.

While it declaims about the freedom of the individual,

¹ Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 36.

bourgeois propaganda is deliberately silent about the chances working people have of availing themselves of their political freedoms and social rights. The concept of freedom as propounded by the bourgeois press has a distinct slant in favour of the propertied classes. In a bourgeois democracy the rich do, indeed, have every freedom to express their opinion—for they control the press, radio and television—and every freedom to get an education—for they have the money to pay for it—and to enjoy the “right” to labour and sponging.

Abolition of private ownership of the means of production changes the situation of the individual. Freedom from exploitation is the basis for all the other freedoms. No man can be free so long as he depends on the whims of his employer, so long as the employer exploits him.

The rights of the individual in socialist society are real, tangible, and secure. Whatever is prescribed by law is guaranteed by the social system, by the existing opportunities and resources, and by the public and government organisations specially created to uphold and defend them. That is one more distinctive feature about the situation of the individual in socialist society. Socialism provides very extensive social rights—the right to labour, to old-age security, to free medical treatment, free education, etc. Those are rights no bourgeois state can ever hope to ensure.

Cumulatively, all these factors create the best of conditions for the development of the individual, of his capacities and his gifts. The Communist Party and the Soviet state want the people to feel what they are—the masters of their land. It is the inviolable right of every member of socialist society to be respected and trusted by his workmates, by the administration, by officials at all the government agencies, and by the various public organisations.

Therefore, it is social justice and equality, democracy and freedom of the individual, coupled with peace and friendship among the nations, that characterise the nature of the state of the whole people.

This brings us to the definition of the state of the whole people. It may appear to be a somewhat abstract matter at first glance, a matter solely for the theorist. But let us not jump to any rash conclusions. A correct definition of the state of the whole people has more than theoretical value. It is important from the practical standpoint as well, because it

gives a clearer idea of the trend in which statehood is developing, because it shows what has to be done to improve and transform it into public self-government, and because this definition gives the masses a clearer conception of their rights and duties vis-à-vis the state.

It will be recalled how immensely effective the definition was which Marx and Lenin made of the bourgeois state, naming it a machine for the suppression of the resistance of its class opponents. It gave rise to the trenchant practical deduction that the proletariat cannot confine itself to merely seizing this machine, since it is adapted to perform the class tasks of the bourgeoisie. To make the transition to socialism, the working class must break up the bourgeois machinery of state and replace it with its own, proletarian state. This was the postulate that governed the policy of the Communists of the U.S.S.R. and the other socialist countries after the proletariat gained power.

But let us go back to the subject at hand.

The definition of a state made by Marxists-Leninists in the past is obviously inadequate to describe the state of the whole people. The state of the whole people is not the instrument of one class. It represents the interests and the will of all the classes and sections of society. It is not an instrument for the suppression by one class of the others, because there are none to be suppressed in Soviet society. It would therefore be incorrect to identify the conception of the state of the whole people with the conception of an instrument of suppression, because the Soviet machinery of state is first and foremost a machinery for the management and administration of economy and culture, laying the accent chiefly on persuasion rather than compulsion. It is also incorrect, because the very conception of the state can no longer be reduced to mere *machinery* by virtue of the development of nation-wide democracy. The state today covers the representative bodies, which are at once bodies of state and public organisations, and the various forms of public self-government. It would perhaps be more accurate to say that the state of the whole people is an organ of the people's self-government and a step forward towards the communist type of public self-government.

What elements should the conception of a state of the whole people contain? To begin with, it should contain the

reply to the question—whom and what purposes this state serves? The answer to that is obvious: it serves the whole people in its struggle for communism. Second, what is the situation of the individual in such a state? We have furnished an answer to that question as well when we spoke of the principles of freedom and socialist equality. Third, what is the difference between bodies of state and public bodies? The answer to that is very important, because we want to trace the transition from state forms of government to public self-government. The main distinction of bodies of state is that, in spite of their development towards self-government, they may whenever necessary employ measures of compulsion to enforce the people's will. Although, as we have pointed out above, the Soviet state chiefly employs persuasion, it is not to be denied that the state retains the monopoly right on compulsion. In that lies one of its essential and specific distinctions. The definition of it should therefore on all accounts point out that, like all other states, the state of the whole people is a body of power.

Considering all these elements, we could perhaps compound the following definition:

The state of the whole people is a people's body of power, an instrument whereby society effects the building of communism and guidance of economic and social processes; secures the freedom of the individual, socialist equality and the people's welfare; maintains relations with other countries in behalf of peace and international friendship, and organises the country's defences.

This definition does not lay claim to being exhaustive, but seems to cover the essential features of the state of the whole people—its social nature, its purposes and its key tasks.

THE TASKS AND FUNCTIONS OF THE STATE OF THE WHOLE PEOPLE

It is only natural that the tasks and functions of the state of the whole people should differ from those of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Obviously, the tasks and functions of the socialist state hinge upon the needs and goals of socialist society. The socialist state satisfies the *vital* needs of society as a whole, and

of all its members, to the extent of its general development and serves the purpose of *further progress* in all spheres of life.

The proletarian state worked on the tasks related to socialist construction. The tasks of the state of the whole people are shaped by the purpose of communist construction and the ultimate transition to public self-government.

The socialist state is part of a system of states. Therefore, the external factor—firstly the formation of the community of socialist states and their mutual commitments, secondly, the survival of bourgeois states and the necessity of maintaining normal relations with them, and, thirdly, the need to safeguard the country's security—is a compelling one in the definition of the tasks and functions of the state.

The functions of a state are the main trends of its activities. They are classed in accordance with the tasks and objects of government and break up into internal functions designed to satisfy the domestic needs of society, and external functions, related to the maintenance of relations with other countries.

The activities of the state of the whole people are very versatile. They spread to the economy and culture, production and consumption, maintenance of law and order and protection of civil rights, the country's defences, and countless other spheres of social life. But some of the functions are basic, others are not.

To begin with, let us list the basic functions of the dictatorship of the proletariat. We shall then see more clearly how they change in the evolution to the state of the whole people. At the time of socialist construction the state performs the following basic tasks and functions—it suppresses the resistance of the exploiting classes, nationalises industry and secures its further development, promotes socialist relations in the countryside, manages the economy and fosters cultural development, educates the masses in the socialist spirit, controls the measure of labour and consumption, protects socialist property and legality, the rights and interests of the citizens, organises the country's defence against external attack, and works for international peace and friendship.

What happens to all these functions during the transition to communism? Some of them expire. This applies to functions related to the exploiting classes—the function of

suppressing the resistance of the class enemy and the functions of reorganising society along socialist lines (nationalisation of production and collectivisation of agriculture). It is different with the other functions. In the state of the whole people they go through further development and change in accordance with the new tasks springing from the transition to communism and the new possibilities wrought by the victory of socialism.

The *function of economic and cultural guidance* advances to the forefront. To be sure, it acquires new content. The national economy grows tremendously in size. Take the Soviet Union. At one time, in the earlier stages of the country's development, the number of factories did not exceed several hundred, or at best a few thousand. Today, the Soviet economy aggregates over 200,000 factories and mines, more than 100,000 projects in the building stage, more than 8,000 state farms¹ and over 40,000 collective farms.² All these are in the common possession of society. This requires the state *to organise the building of the material and technical basis of communism*. The enormity of the task is best illustrated by the figures set out in the Programme of the C.P.S.U. In the course of twenty years (1961-80) aggregate industrial output is to increase at least sixfold, the productivity of labour 300 to 350 per cent, the annual output of electric power is to rise to 2,700-3,000 thousand million kwh, and the steel output to 250 million tons. The output of farm products is to increase over the same period by 250 per cent.

Needless to say, guidance of so immense an economy will call for new methods, new forms of organisation designed to stimulate the growth of the productive forces and the initiative of the masses.

Some theorists attempted to prove that the economic functions of the state ought to diminish in the period of socialist construction, and still more so during the transition to communism. The economic functions, they maintained, ought to be carried through by public organisations.

At first glance, their train of thought looks very attractive. They seem to be offering a way for increasing the role of

¹ *State farm*—large-scale state-operated socialist farm.—Ed.

² *Collective farm*—socialist farming co-operative based on the voluntary association of peasants for joint large-scale collective farming on state land.—Ed.

the working class and the other working people in economic management. But, in effect, their approach is likely to do harm to economic development, to retard its rate, and, hence, to impair the effort of improving the living standard of the masses.

Beyond question, the role of the masses in economic development and management keeps rising continuously during the transition to communism. That is, indeed, one of the key conditions for its success. But why should it affect the economic role of the state, which is in the hands of the working people and serves as an instrument in their struggle for communism?

The masses are being more and more extensively drawn to managing the economy. This is being done through all the existing channels of the political system. The role of the Communist Party is increasing, and so is the role of the various public organisations, particularly the trade unions. The masses participate in the discussion of the economic plans and the more important bills and laws. However, the economic activities of various bodies of state are on the increase as well.

During the transition to communism the state's economic function still retains its political complexion. The classes remain. So does the principle of wage labour, and hence a certain inequality in distribution and consumption. The economy is still based on commodity production and sales, and on the two forms of state and co-operative ownership.¹ The state is therefore necessary, in order to manage the economy and fix the measure of labour and consumption, for none but the state operating in behalf of the whole people

¹ *Socialist state property*, i.e., property of the whole people—the land, mineral wealth, water, forests, factories, mines, transport facilities, banks, means of communication, large-scale farms organised and run by the state, various community services and the basic housing facilities in the towns and industrial estates. State property is the dominant and leading form of property under socialism.

Co-operative property, more precisely called co-operative-kolkhoz property, is the property of the various individual kolkhozes (collective farms) and other types of co-operatives.

The term applies to the public enterprises on the collective farms and to co-operatives with their diverse property and livestock, the products they put out and their commonly owned buildings. The land occupied and cultivated by the collective farms is granted to them for free use in perpetuity.—Ed.

can blend the interests of society as a whole with those of the various collectives and individuals.

The state employs the method of persuasion to carry through the economic policy of and for the people, but whenever necessary it applies compulsion as well—in maintaining discipline in production, reprimanding and punishing offenders of public interests, etc. The gradual transformation of the state's economic functions will therefore keep pace with the gradual moderation of their political complexion.

The state's economic functions do not rule out increasing participation of the masses in economic management. On the contrary, they tend to encourage it, because the democracy of the socialist state is expanding continuously. The Communist Party, for one, is promoting increasingly broader participation of working people in economic management.

But, naturally, the building of communism will not end once its material and technical basis is ready. *The development of socialist relations into communist relations* is a task of equal magnitude. This applies first and foremost to the economic sphere. The relations in production, the development of the forms of property, distribution and the ways in which the masses participate in economic management—all these factors are to be gradually repatterned along communist lines. The role of the state in this process is very great, because the working people run the economy by means of the state.

There are also the attendant tasks of *educating the masses in the spirit of conscious discipline and the communist attitude towards work*. The various state and public bodies, backed by public initiative, strive to promote voluntary work by all members of society for the common weal. This is particularly important during the time of transition to communism. Work is the only source of wealth and the earnest of prosperity. Nothing but selfless and intensive labour, joyful and creative, will yield the whole people complete abundance of all blessings. The greatest achievements will not be attained by compulsion, but by people willing and eager to work, and conscious of their purpose and goal. It is natural, therefore, that it is one of the most important tasks of the state to instil a sense of labour discipline among all concerned.

The state's function of *controlling the measure of labour and the measure of consumption and securing a betterment*

of the people's living standard changes in substance. After all, the dimensions and forms of distribution increase immensely. In the socialist environment the measure of labour and distribution depends more than ever not only on the work of every individual, but also on the work of society as a whole.

The state of the whole people retains the function of *safe-guarding the rights and freedoms of the citizens, socialist law and order and socialist property.*

Now about the *external* functions of the state of the whole people. The Programme of the C.P.S.U. lays strong emphasis on the function of *ensuring the defence and security of the country and strengthening the Armed Forces of the Soviet Union.*

The Soviet Union works very hard for international peace. It was the Soviet Union that came forward with the programme for general and complete disarmament under strict international control, which was acclaimed by all the peoples of the world. But so long as the imperialist powers refuse to accept this programme, so long as they pursue a policy of war preparation, the Soviet Union is compelled to see to the fitness of its Armed Forces.

The Soviet Union does not need an army from the standpoint of its internal affairs. The U.S.S.R. has no classes that are to be suppressed by armed force. But the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries have to consider the danger of war. For this reason, the C.P.S.U. and the Soviet state maintain the defensive potential of the country at the due level, ensuring decisive and rapid defeat of any possible aggressor. In that lies the guarantee of peace for the peoples of the Soviet land, and of the security of all the peoples of the world.

The Soviet Union has normal political, economic and other relations with the capitalist countries. That is another important fact. The socialist state pursues a flexible and active Leninist foreign policy. Lenin's idea that politics is a science and an art, and is more like algebra than arithmetic, seems to be particularly valid in our time, marked by great dynamism, rapid change of acute situations and the operation of numerous, very different forces on the world scene. Firm adherence to principle and the ability to make mutual compromises for the sake of peace, continuous exposure of mili-

tary intrigues and the dedication of all diplomatic channels to the business of mitigating the international situation—these and many other features of the foreign policy of socialist states are forcefully in evidence at the present time, when the scales are tilting more and more in favour of peace and socialism.

The defence of peace and the security of the peoples is the basis of Soviet foreign policy. It is the air it breathes. The Soviet land fights for peace. It wants mankind to be spared the terrors of a thermonuclear war. It does not want the fate of Hiroshima and Nagasaki to overtake the thousands of cities in the world. It wants people to be relieved at last of the depressing fear of nuclear annihilation. It wants people to gain serenity and confidence in the future.

It was not surprising at all, therefore, that the socialist countries initiated all the important proposals aimed at reinforcing peace and peaceful coexistence. It is a fact which discloses the essence of the foreign policy of the socialist countries.

The peace-abiding nature of Soviet policy was evident in October-November 1962 during the crisis in the Caribbean. The Caribbean event illuminated the positions of all the forces active on the world scene like a flash of lightning. It was one of those events in history which reveal the true aims and plans of all the parties concerned.

The people saw how far the extreme aggressive imperialist groups, who put mankind on the brink of disaster, can go in their adventurist policy. On the other hand, all the people of the world had a chance to see again at that perilous hour that the Soviet Union was a consistent and devoted friend of peace, a friend of mankind. The socialist countries again demonstrated their devotion to peace, their courage and presence of mind, their equanimity and their deep confidence in the outcome of the struggle for the prevention of a new world war.

In that difficult situation, with mankind hovering on the brink of a world nuclear disaster, the Soviet Union remained loyal to its policy of peace and peaceful coexistence.

This attitude of the Soviet state was a logical upshot of its foreign policy. The idea of peaceful coexistence is not a tactical dodge, but the fundamental trend in Soviet policy. It is predicated by the lofty ideals of the Communists, who have

set themselves imposing goals. Their methods of action conform to these goals. No Communists will ever employ the imperialist method of bending other nations to their will. They believe in the progressive nature of communism. They are certain that it will win the hearts and minds of men by its example, and that mankind will ultimately prefer it to capitalism.

The Soviet policy of peaceful coexistence is motivated not only by the desire for international peace. It is based on a realistic appraisal of the balance of forces in the world today and on the knowledge of what a new world war would bring in its wake. None but ill-informed and foolish people with no sense of responsibility can in our time pin their hopes and plans on a world war.

What with the present balance of forces in the world, coupled with the amazing advance of military techniques, peaceful coexistence is the only sensible policy to follow. The peoples are faced with the alternative of either a thermonuclear disaster or peaceful coexistence. In other words, peaceful coexistence is an objective necessity in the present stage of history.

Like the other socialist countries, the Soviet Union knows that truly sensible peaceful coexistence presupposes reciprocal concessions by the two systems in the interests of peace. To settle controversial international problems, the states with different social systems must meet each other halfway and strive for agreement on a mutually acceptable basis, in order to prevent the appearance of tension. Compromises are possible on two conditions only—if they are designed to reinforce the peace and if they do not involve any betrayal of principle. They must not be one-sided. It is absurd, however, to reject the necessity and possibility of compromises in principle. The peaceful coexistence of the two systems is, indeed, in a way a mutual compromise. The socialist and the capitalist systems are diametrically opposite in their socio-economic nature. They are antagonistic. So, obviously, their coexistence necessarily implies a compromise. The socialist countries, on the one hand, are compelled to suffer the existence of the capitalist system, and to take it into consideration. And the capitalist countries, on the other, are compelled to suffer the socialist system, and to reckon with it.

It is only fair to say that not all the leaders of the Western world have succumbed to military hysteria. There are people among them who take a level-headed view of the balance of forces in the world and who realise that a world war would be suicidal for the imperialist countries. The socialist countries would welcome the advancement of a moderate and sober policy, a realistic appraisal of the balance of forces, an acceptance of mutual compromises and concessions, by the imperialist camp. This would help to prevent a world-wide disaster. In their struggle for peace, the socialist countries make the most of all factors and do their best to unite the forces opposed to the extremist aggressive and bellicose imperialist groups in order to thwart the latter's designs.

The foreign policy pursued by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries is designed to marshal all the forces of peace and progress against imperialism and war, and to resolve the basic problem of our time—general and complete disarmament under rigorous international control.

Backed by their increasing power, extending contacts with all the neutralist and peace-abiding countries, the states of the socialist community are obtaining practical results in the matter of relaxing international tensions and stamping out the seats of war.

The Moscow Treaty banning nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water was acclaimed by all the nations. It had a good effect on the international situation and sustained the peace hopes of millions of people throughout the world.

The Treaty is a credit to the Leninist policy of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems.

The relations maintained by the Soviet Union with the national states of Africa, Asia and Latin America, which have rid themselves of the colonial yoke, have many distinctive features. They are based on extensive political support and disinterested assistance of the national liberation movement on the part of the U.S.S.R. and the other socialist countries.

Today, the peoples of the underdeveloped countries fighting for independence and social liberation can depend not only on the political support of the socialist camp, but on its economic assistance and close economic co-operation. Soviet assistance to the People's Democracies of Europe and Asia,

and the economic co-operation of all the socialist countries, show graphically that today any country in the world, regardless of its level of development, is able to achieve national independence and carry through radical social changes. The countries that have effected national revolutions are offered the economic assistance, co-operation and support of the socialist countries without any political strings.

The assistance rendered by the socialist states to the economically underdeveloped countries is of immense importance. To begin with, it is designed to invigorate the key industries of the underdeveloped countries, helping their industrialisation. Secondly, it invigorates the state sector of their national economies, fostering economic development. Third, it impairs the monopoly of the imperialist countries on the delivery of commodities to former colonies and semi-colonies, compelling the imperialists to make concessions in their economic relations with the underdeveloped countries.

In a nutshell, the economically underdeveloped countries have reliable friends in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. This is creating favourable international conditions for the emergence of national democratic states, which are able to make a sustained stand for independence in the struggle against colonialism and imperialism, and to carry through progressive social and political reforms.

The U.S.S.R. and other socialist countries are exercising a strong influence on world development by erecting barriers in the political field to international reaction, which attempts to interfere in the affairs of other countries. This is of cardinal importance to the peoples who are in the throes of national anti-imperialist, or socialist revolution.

"The Communist Parties, which guide themselves by the Marxist-Leninist doctrine," says the 1960 Statement of the Moscow Meeting of Communist Parties, "have always been against the export of revolution. At the same time they fight resolutely against the imperialist export of counter-revolution. They consider it their internationalist duty to call on the peoples of all countries to unite, to rally all their internal forces, to act vigorously and, relying on the might of the world socialist system, to prevent or firmly resist imperialist interference in the affairs of any people who have risen in revolution."

Last but not least, there is a new function the Soviet state

did not have before. It is the function of *developing fraternal co-operation with the socialist countries*. This function appeared when the socialist system emerged in the world after the victory of revolutions in a number of European and Asian countries following the Second World War.

The socialist countries maintain a new type of interstate relations. These are based on the principles of equality, fraternity, co-operation, and mutual assistance. Stemming from the identity of social system and ideology, identity of the tasks and goals of socialist states, these relations serve as the prototype of the international relations that will prevail after socialism triumphs throughout the world.

The economies of the socialist countries are coming closer together. Their economic co-operation is of the utmost importance. Socialism is inaugurating a veritable internationalisation of economy, prompted by the contemporary level of the productive forces. The tendency to create a single world-wide economy developing in conformance with a common plan, Lenin stressed, "has quite palpably come to the fore under capitalism and will unquestionably develop further towards its final completion under socialism".¹

Ever since the socialist system came into the world, its member countries worked for close and versatile economic co-operation. This co-operation has helped the socialist countries to achieve striking results.

Today, a new stage has begun in the development of the socialist community. Economic, scientific and technical co-operation between the socialist countries is sure to rise to a higher level. Co-ordination of economic planning, co-operation and specialisation in production, and increasing exchanges of commodities and technical information are very necessary measures for the development of the socialist system.

The socialist system is rapidly turning into a major industrial complex. Its share in world output has by now increased to something like 37 per cent. Gradual internationalisation of the economies of the socialist countries is paving the way to further, more rapid development and is bringing nearer the victory in the peaceful economic competition with capitalism.

¹ Lenin, "Original Draft of Theses on the National and Colonial Questions", *Collected Works*, Vol. 31.

This confronts the socialist countries with a number of additional, extremely important tasks, and imparts special significance to the development of co-operation between the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

The fact that the *forms and methods* of the state bodies *change* is a most important feature of the state of the whole people. In contrast to the dictatorship of the proletariat, which employs methods of class compulsion whenever necessary, combining them with education and persuasion, the state of the whole people lays prime emphasis on education and persuasion.

This does not mean that the need for state compulsion no longer exists. No, socialism does not as yet eliminate this need entirely. As we said, under socialism inequality in consumption and survivals of individualist anti-social ideologies remain. This may serve as a breeding ground for anti-social offences and crimes. Such bodies as the militia and the courts of law are therefore still necessary. But they no longer serve as the instrument of a class. They serve society as a whole. They are not aimed against any class, but rather against anti-social individuals. Furthermore, all the work of these bodies tends to blend methods of punishment with the re-education of offenders.

The transition from dictatorship of the proletariat to a state of the whole people represents *an improvement in the existing forms of state life and implies the appearance of new forms* conforming to the task of communist construction and paving the way for public communist self-government.

The political and social organisation of the Soviet people embraces both state and public bodies and other institutions of public initiative and self-government. This applies to representative and executive bodies of the state, the Communist Party, the trade unions, the co-operatives, youth and other public unions and alliances. Furthermore, there are diverse and flexible means whereby the people may participate directly in the solution of matters of state, such, for example, as the nation-wide discussion of the most important bills.

All these institutions change in the environment of the state of the whole people, and the changes are so essential and important that they deserve to be treated in a special chapter.

THE STATE OF THE WHOLE PEOPLE AND ITS SOCIO-POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS

All-round extension and perfection of socialist democracy, active participation of all citizens in the administration of the state, in the management of economic and cultural development, improvement of the government apparatus, and increased control over its activity by the people constitute the main direction in which socialist statehood develops in the period of the building of communism.

Programme of the C.P.S.U.

We now come to a question which is, in a manner of speaking, the core of the idea of the state of the whole people. The political, and hence the practical purport of this idea is that the forms in which the state discharges its affairs must necessarily be consistent with the level of development attained by society as a whole. This development, the high level of culture and the political consciousness of the people, insistently requires riper and better forms of government.

In the early years of Soviet power Lenin wrote that "the Soviets are a higher form of democracy, and even more, the beginning of the *socialist* form of democracy."¹ He stressed that "victorious socialism must necessarily establish a full democracy".² Its continuous development, he added, would ultimately lead to the replacement of forms of the state by public self-government, to the withering away of statehood. Lenin's forecasts, we see, are coming true. After the complete and final victory of socialism, when the state became a state of the whole people, proletarian democracy turned fully into socialist democracy.

The transformation of the dictatorship of the proletariat into a state of the whole people is not a question of termi-

¹ Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, p. 724.

² Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 143.

nology, not a mere change of name. It reflects processes in the development of the Soviet land. At the same time, it substantiates in theory the line of the further development and improvement of socialist democracy. That, indeed, is the point of departure for the C.P.S.U. in shaping its policy of state construction.

Before going on to facts illustrating the growth of socialist democracy, we should like to note that it stems intrinsically from the very nature of the socialist system and that it accords with the demands of socialist construction, the goals and tasks of this construction. It is one of the aspects of communist construction and, at once, the crucial condition of its success.

Socialist democracy stimulates the development of socialist society. Public ownership of the means of production, and planning, pave the way for striking increases in the rate of economic and social development. But we should always bear in mind that planned economy does not automatically create favourable conditions. It only offers the very best opportunities for the initiative, and the gifts and faculties of all the members of society. The more highly developed socialist democracy is, and the more fully the masses participate in production and in socio-political affairs, the better these opportunities become.

The development of democracy speeds communist construction, because, among other things, it is the best medium for the elaboration of correct solutions, a guarantee against abuse and subjectivism. It prompts millions of people to examine economic and social processes, and to discuss the crucial problems of communist construction on a nation-wide scale. And whenever solutions are based on the wisdom, the sagacity and experience of millions of people, the right solution, consistent with the needs of society, is bound to emerge.

The development of socialist democracy corresponds to the most cherished ideals of communism, whose chief goal is to make man happy and to promote his abilities and talents. Democratic rights and freedoms are no less real and important to the man of socialist society than material blessings. Thereby we do not just mean the social rights of citizens, such as the rights to labour, leisure and education, which are tangible, but also such political rights as active

participation in the administration of production and culture, and in all social affairs. This makes life richer. It yields satisfaction and stimulates the abilities and talents, the political awareness and the general culture of all concerned. People's consciousness, we know, develops chiefly in the process of practical activities. No book ever written, no degree of education, can fully replace personal experience, and it is experience that people accumulate when helping to administer the affairs of society, work out state laws and decisions, and implement them consciously.

Acting upon the needs of communist construction, the Communist Party has set its sights on the further development of socialist democracy and on making the forms, means and methods of government more democratic.

This process, we might note, has very many facets. It embraces many fields—economy, culture and politics—and operates in a variety of ways. But for all its numerous facets, it has, as a whole, a common trend. It lays an emphasis on various forms of initiative and self-government by the working people, on the development of the influence which the Soviet public exercises on the solution of all matters.

It should be stressed at this point that Marxists attach an entirely different meaning to the conception of the "public" than bourgeois publicists, who often abuse this term. To the latter, the public connotes more or less narrow groups from among the privileged classes, the "educated people", who are afforded the opportunity of influencing state affairs through representative institutions or the press. To the bourgeois mind the "public" has a restricted sense, drawing a line between the privileged élite conversant in politics and participating in government, and the rest of the people.

Marxists have an entirely different idea of the public. In the U.S.S.R., the public means all the working people—the workers, peasants, and the intelligentsia, who all participate in government and exercise an influence on the affairs of state. Soviet public opinion is generalised and projected in the decisions of the Party and the state. Therein lies the source of the depth, wisdom and prestige of these decisions.

THE MAIN TRENDS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF DEMOCRACY

Greater democracy in production, a more consistent democratic centralism in the management of economy, are of cardinal importance. One manager once said:

"Why do you talk about democracy in economic management? The economy hinges on entirely different factors, such as new technology, the automation and mechanisation of labour, the right geographical distribution of production, thrift, incentives for the workers, etc. That is what the productivity of labour, the chief indicator in production, depends on. So where does democracy come in?"

On the face of it, the manager appears to be right. But he is not. What he listed were factors which exercise an *immediate* influence on production. He overlooked many of the more deep-rooted and essential things.

None will dispute the fact that good production hinges on the aforesaid and a few other economic factors. But it is living people who work out and fulfil various economic and other measures. This applies largely to people managing production and its various sections. They do it well or badly, depending on their competence, their knowledge, capacity and experience. Yet it is socialist democracy through which capable and gifted organisers are promoted and selected to the various managerial offices. It is socialist democracy, respect for the opinion of Party, government and trade union groups, the opinion of workers, peasants and intellectuals, that guarantees the best selection of "managers" and their timely replacement and renewal.

Take the method employed by the Party in the past few years, when it had to pick tens of thousands of organisers and send them to the collective and state farms. They were picked at discussions in the primary Party organisations, the district and regional Party committees, etc.

That is a graphic example of how democracy works in resolving economic matters. What socialist democracy induces is unparalleled mass enthusiasm in socialist and communist construction. Clear appreciation of the imposing prospects of development by the masses, their confidence in the chosen path, constitute a potent creative force.

Improvement of forms of economic management is therefore very strongly pursued. Solution of the economic tasks of communism is the basis for the solution of all the other tasks. To advance rapidly, the system of industrial and agricultural management must be made to accord with the level of development already attained.

The Soviet Union's industrial and agricultural production had grown so much that managing it *directly* from one centre was ineffective and undesirable. Production compellingly required that the centre of gravity in economic management shift to the localities—the republics, regions, districts, factories, and farms. The central bodies of management retained only such functions as apply to production as a whole.

Furthermore, it was necessary to eradicate the hypercentralism which pervaded management in the last few years of Stalin's life. It was therefore necessary to stimulate local initiative and to make better use of economic incentives; to lay the accent in management not on orders from the top, but on the economic levers; to improve the forms of management so that the economic requirements themselves, the material incentives, should stimulate production.

The establishment of geographical economic councils was an important measure in this respect. Economic councils were first established on Lenin's initiative in the early years of Soviet power. Later, seeing that it was necessary to develop some industries (especially heavy industries) at a particularly rapid rate, these economic councils were replaced by people's commissariats, subsequently renamed ministries and departments.

The re-establishment of economic councils was not a mechanical revival of old forms. The new councils were founded *along the lines* of the previous councils, but they did not copy them in either the organisational respect or in their distribution by regions. Industry and building is dozens of times greater in scale today than it was in the twenties. New branches of industry have been built up. It is only natural, therefore, that the present-day economic councils, though similar to the old, are essentially different. Their degree of independence in the management of factories, in financial affairs and the disposal of material resources, is much greater.

When the economic councils were established, many fac-

tories were put in the charge of republican and local bodies of power. The fact that the centre of gravity in the management of industry and building shifted to the localities made it possible to greatly increase the number of people handling economic development, and generally speaking, encouraged broader participation of the masses in management. New forms appeared of drawing the masses into economic management. The public scientific and economic committees set up by the economic councils are, for one, quite effective. They draw on researchers, scientists and workers for their membership and tend to stimulate the initiative and influence of the working people.

Important measures were taken to improve agricultural management. Take the changes in agricultural planning, the sale of agricultural machinery to the collective farms, the establishment of inter-district bodies of management, etc. Not only are these measures economically effective. What is more important, they help to develop collective-farm democracy. The collective farmers feel now that the results of public production depend on them, and that their welfare depends on these results. So they take a more lively part in managing the affairs of their farm. New forms of collective-farm democracy are emerging alongside the old—the general meeting, the collective-farm board, etc. Let us name just one—the technical production councils set up under the executive committees of the district Soviets.

The greater rights given to the republican and local bodies of power also involved the sphere of political democracy. Judiciary legislation and legislation on the civil, criminal and procedural codes has been made the competence of the republican governments. The authority of republican courts of law has been extended. This makes administration more democratic for the simple reason that public control over bodies of power and government is always more effective if those bodies are geographically nearer, because it is then much easier to call on the masses to help resolve the affairs of state.

The Soviets of Working People's Deputies, that leading institution of the country's political system, have made immense headway. After the complete victory of socialism they have, in substance, become the bodies of power of *the whole people*. Their role and their decisive influence on all the

processes going on in the country has grown considerably in the last few years. In the present Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., workers and collective farmers directly employed in production comprise 45 per cent of all the Deputies. The Supreme Soviets of the Union Republics are no less representative. All in all, 1,095 of their deputies are workers, 1,359 are collective farmers, 83 are farm specialists, 100 are teachers, 145 are researchers, and 149 are servicemen. As many as 32.3 per cent of the deputies are women. These figures are graphic evidence that Soviet democracy is a democracy of the whole people.

The Soviets of Working People's Deputies are bodies of power. But at the same time they are broadly representative public bodies. They reflect one of the most distinctive features of the socio-political system of the U.S.S.R.—a kind of combination of the state and the public element, the junction where society passes into the state. The deputies to the Soviets are elected from the most active section of the public by the most democratic means—direct elections. They are held responsible and accountable to the population, and may be recalled at any time by public demand.

In the past few years, the representative bodies of the Soviet state have greatly increased their work. They have extended their functions, and all their deputies are involved in the practice of government. They endorse budgets and economic plans, and deliberate other important matters pertaining to the state and to economic and cultural development.

The fact that public organisations are playing a bigger role and have assumed some of the functions of the state is a fundamentally new trend in the development of socialist democracy. Their influence on the life of society, on the work of the machinery of state, depends upon at least three factors—first, on the composition of the organisation concerned, on how broad a section of the population it embraces; second, on how active its membership is, that is, on how democratic it is; third, on its authority, on its rights and duties.

The membership of the various public organisations is growing continuously. In 1928, the trade unions had an aggregate membership of 10,900,000. In 1941 their membership rose to 25,000,000, and in 1963 it was 68,000,000. The

Communist Youth League had 700,000 members in 1924, about 4,000,000 members in 1936, and has more than 20,000,000 members today.

In 1922, peasant co-operatives could be counted on the fingers of one hand. In 1959, members of collective farms totalled over 65,500,000.

Then there are the various associations of writers, architects and other professional workers, sports clubs, etc.

To sum up, practically the entire adult population is at present associated with some organisation. These various organisations will doubtlessly grow, but the figures we have given here show that this is scarcely a matter of prime importance. It is more important to develop the initiative of these public organisations, to make all their members more active, to instil more democracy in them. The Communist Party attaches immense importance to the development of democracy in the trade unions, the Communist Youth League, the various co-operatives and other public organisations. It has achieved some good results. The congresses of trade unions, the Youth League, of the Soviet writers, composers and scientists, and the animation that reigns at these congresses, the more lively and regular activities of the bodies elected by them, are an encouraging indication.

The functions, rights and duties of the public organisations have been extended. This has stimulated the initiative and the creative bend of their membership. Much has been done in this respect in the past few years.

It is of utmost importance that the trade unions should play a bigger role in society. The working class, that leading force of Soviet society, is exercising a tremendous and fruitful influence on the peasants and other sections of the population, on the administration of economy and culture, on the formation of the communist way of life and communist consciousness.

Production conferences which involve workers and employees have been transformed into permanently functioning bodies. Greater authority has been granted to them. Trade union locals at factories and offices have also been given more extensive rights. The results of this were quick to appear. The initiative of the working class and the office employees has increased. The traditional forms of trade union work have acquired a new content.

Production conferences at factories and building projects have always been one of the important media for the participation of the working class in the management. They are a vehicle for mass public control over the administration, which blends with the principle of single leadership in production.

These conferences are organised along democratic lines and are formed of men and women elected at general meetings of workers and office employees, to whom they are accountable for what they do. The matters within their competence are many—the drafting and discussion of current and long-term plans, matters pertaining to the organisation of production, labour, wages, output rates, new techniques, house-building and the building of cultural and service facilities, etc. Beyond question, it was the production conferences that paved the way for new forms in which factory and office workers participate in management—the production committees.¹

The increasing influence exercised by co-operatives on various economic matters follows the same line. The unions of writers, composers and other creative workers, the various academies of sciences and universities are exercising an increasing influence on matters pertaining to culture, science and art, the Communist Youth League on production and education, and all the various public organisations on the activities of the bodies of state.

At present, sports and sports leadership has passed entirely into the hands of the public. A public body has been set up to govern sports affairs—the Council of Sports Societies and Clubs. The trade unions and other public organisations will gradually take over the administration of public health, the issue of pensions, and many other public services.

One of the more difficult problems in which the public is taking an increasing part is the problem of public order and the observance of the rules of socialist human relations. Volunteer groups have appeared to help the militia maintain public order, and so have comradesly courts, the socialist variety of the court of honour. As time goes on, these and

¹ Production committees and other measures illustrating the trends and prospects of the development of socialist democracy are discussed in the next chapter.

other organisations of public self-government are coming to play a bigger role, particularly in the field of crime prevention, because the opinion and influence of work-mates, and public opinion generally, are most effective in safeguarding offenders from taking to crime.

Continuous extension of the rights of working people, of their direct participation in the administration of the state, is one of the chief trends in the development of socialist democracy.

This process follows two paths. On the one hand, due to rising living and cultural standards all citizens gain a more realistic opportunity of using their political and social rights. Reduction of the working day to six hours will, in the future, afford people more leisure, which they could use to good advantage in public and political activities.

On the other hand, these opportunities increase because the state improves the old forms and works out new forms to attract the masses to the business of government.

Nation-wide discussions of questions pertaining to communist construction, and of draft laws, has been practised widely in the past few years. The draft of the new Pensions Law was discussed on a nation-wide scale. The radical reorganisation of industry and building was discussed by tens of millions of people. There was a nation-wide discussion of the further strengthening of the collective-farm system. Furthermore, central and local conferences of specialists were called to discuss important matters pertaining to building, various branches of industry and agriculture, and the arts. More than 100 million people, that is, practically the entire adult population, took part in the discussion of the draft of the Programme and of the Rules of the C.P.S.U. This has helped the Party and the state to generalise the experience of millions of people and to adopt more effective decisions. Furthermore, it has helped to develop the initiative of the working people.

THE ROLE OF THE PARTY INCREASES

As the dictatorship of the proletariat changed into a state of the whole people, so did the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the guiding force of Soviet society, change into

a party of the whole people, and as a result its role increased greatly.

The Party's membership has grown considerably. At the time of the 22nd Party Congress it approached 10,000,000 members and candidate members, but the change in its social composition, which mirrors the class composition of the Soviet nation as a whole, is naturally the essential indication. As before, the Party attaches importance to reinforcing its ranks with workers and peasants, people active in the sphere of material production. The percentage of workers in the Party is relatively greater than the percentage of workers in Soviet society. That is one way the working class discharges its leading role. The number of C.P.S.U. members active in agriculture has grown, too. Since 1953 their number has increased by 600,000.

The increase has also affected the intelligentsia. Suffice it to say that Communist Party members with a higher or secondary education exceed 3 million. In other words, nearly every third Communist today has a higher or secondary education. The numerical growth of the intelligentsia in the Party membership was only to be expected. The intelligentsia, as such, has increased tremendously in the country, and its role in Soviet society has grown.

Most of the Communists are rank-and-file working people. One hundred and thirty per 1,000 Communists employed in production held administrative jobs in 1956. In recent years this average shrank to 46. The bulk of the Party membership, more than 70 per cent, are employed directly in industry. These facts, by the way, repugn the bourgeois contention that the C.P.S.U. is a "managerial stratum".

The development of the Party into an organisation of the whole people affected its methods of work. They are becoming more democratic and hinge much more now on the initiative and voluntary efforts of the masses. The Programme of the C.P.S.U. says:

"The Party considers it its duty always to consult the working people on the major questions of home and foreign policy, to make these questions an object of nation-wide discussion, and to attract more non-members to participation in all its work."

This proposition is being carried into practice. A large number of Communists and non-Party people take an active part in sittings of Party committees, both central and local. The same applies to the discussion of major questions related to Party policy at broad conferences involving large sections of the population, and to nation-wide discussions of programmatic Party documents, such as the draft Programme of the C.P.S.U. a few years ago, and to very many other public measures.

The regulated replacement of functionaries in the Party leadership is another indication that the nature of the Party, now an organisation of the whole people, has changed. The more Communists serve terms in Party offices, and the more regularly the leadership at various levels changes, the better the Party body functions, and the better does the Party reflect the opinions of all the Communists, and of all non-Communists as well.

The Party is the foremost force of the Soviet people, and, naturally, the Soviet people regard its mounting influence, the influence of its ideology on society, as a guarantee of success in communist construction, a guarantee of higher living standards and of democratic development.

Socialist democracy is democracy enacted under the leadership of the working class and of its Party, which becomes a party of the whole people after the victory of socialism. It is the Party, the most advanced and revolutionary detachment of the working people, that exercises leadership over all the other institutions of society, bodies of state and government included.

The reasons for this are many. Firstly, the Party is the bearer of Marxism-Leninism, the working-class ideology, the ideology of all working people. It instils socialist consciousness in the masses. And that, to be sure, is a key factor for the reorganisation of society along socialist and communist lines.

Secondly, the Party consists of the most advanced and politically conscious workers and people of all the other sections, to whom the nation has entrusted leadership.

Thirdly, as a public political organisation rather than a body of state, the Party is better fitted to exercise leadership based on persuasion and conscious discipline, and not on compulsion. There are Party members in all organisations,

public and official, enabling the Party to direct their work, as it were, from within through the Communists and Party groups in them.

The charge of bourgeois ideologists about the "monopoly situation of the Communist Party" does not hold water. Power in the socialist countries is held by the people, the sovereign and supreme authority. The people are the sole source of power. There is no other.

At the same time, the Communists make no secret of the fact that their Party plays a special role in the system of socialist democracy. It is not the "usual" role played by a party of the governing class, such as is played by, say, the various bourgeois parties, because the historical mission of the working class and its allies is "unusual". The bourgeoisie (and consequently its parties) has a negative, essentially reactionary task—to maintain the existing situation, to retain power, and to avert revolution. The working class (and consequently its party) has a great, creative, revolutionary task which no other class in history has ever had—to reshape social relations radically and to build a classless communist society. This calls for immense effort by the working class and the whole people. It calls for unity of purpose and for a deep understanding of the objective laws of social development. It calls for a clear programme of action.

"None but the political party of the working class, that is, the Communist Party," Lenin wrote, "is able to unite, educate and organise a vanguard of proletarians and all the masses capable of withstanding the inevitable petty-bourgeois vacillations of the masses, the inevitable tradition and recurrence of professional narrow-mindedness and professional prejudice among the proletariat, and to exercise leadership over the united activities of the whole proletariat, that is, to lead it politically, and to lead all the masses through it."¹

In contrast to the bourgeois parties, which represent the interests of a small minority, the Communist Party represents the interests of the working class, of all working people—the overwhelming majority of society—and after socialism is built, it represents all society. The governing bourgeois party is usually small numerically, while Communist Parties embrace

¹ Lenin, "Tenth Congress of the R.C.P.(B)", *Collected Works*, Vol. 32.

a large section of society, the most active and politically conscious workers and other working people. The Party does not retard, but, on the contrary, stimulates by all means at its disposal the initiative of non-Party people. It promotes them to offices of leadership, and reckons with their opinion. It is always eager to extend its ties with the masses, because that is the earnest of socialist success, and promotes democracy in the socio-political system. "To do service to the masses," Lenin said, "and express *their* interests, having correctly conceived those interests, the advanced contingent, the organisation, must carry on all its activity among the masses, drawing from the masses all the best forces without any exception, at every step verifying carefully and objectively whether contact with the masses is being maintained and whether it is a live contact. In this way, and *only* in this way, does the advanced contingent train and enlighten the masses, expressing their interests, teaching them organisation and directing *all* the activities of the masses along the path of conscious class politics."¹

It should also be borne in mind that the oligarchic regime prevailing in the bourgeois parties does not exist in Communist Parties, which act on the principle of democratic centralism. This is an important guarantee of collective leadership, of collective methods of reaching decisions.

The Communist Party does not and cannot have any particular interests distinct from the interests of the masses, nor any egoistic goals and aspirations. The Party pursues a policy of the whole people, a policy of peace, welfare, democracy and communism. Consequently, far from contradicting democracy, its guiding role is a condition for democracy, a factor that imparts socialist substance to democracy.

This shows how far removed from the truth are the fabrications about Party "dictatorship" or "monopoly" under socialism.

In their criticism of the Programme of the C.P.S.U., opponents of communism, particularly from among the Right Social-Democrats keep harping on the Soviet one-party system. They maintain that absence of other parties implies absence of democracy. They consider the existence of two or more parties an essential criterion of "classical democracy".

¹ Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, p. 409.

But, to begin with, it is wrong to say that the existence of many parties is essential for democracy. Speaking of "classical democracy", it would be only right to recall the democracy of the ancient world. Neither Greece, nor Rome in the republican epoch, had any idea of what we now call the many-party system. Nor did this interfere in any way with the struggle of opinions among free citizens.

But that is not the essential. The weakness of the bourgeois contentions concerning the one-party system is that it is abstract, unspecific, and far removed from concrete historical experience. In the meantime, experience shows that in different conditions the one-party system (just as the many-party system) may have a different content.

It is beyond question, indeed, that in a bourgeois society, split into hostile classes, the one-party system is regressive as compared to the many-party system, because it connotes suppression of the working class and of its party, of all progressive elements, by the most reactionary section of the imperialist bourgeoisie. This is illustrated by fascist rule in Germany and Italy, where the fascists wiped out all the progressive forces.

The content of the one-party system in Soviet society, which consists of two friendly classes—the workers and peasants—and of the intelligentsia, is diametrically opposite. In Soviet society the working-class party expresses the interests not only of its class, but of society as a whole, because these interests are the same in their basic purport—the struggle for communism, which corresponds with the aspirations of all the working people.

The many-party system, too, may have different contents. In the United States, for example, the bourgeoisie exercises its dominance through a few parties. On the other hand, the many-party system in some of the People's Democracies, where the working-class party holds the guiding role, serves socialist construction.

It is therefore quite clear that the number of parties in a state is not a criterion of the substance of the political system concerned. What is important is whose interests the policy of the governing party represents.

The Communist Party has always, since its inception, served the people faithfully. Its policy is designed to realise

the great communist ideals of freedom for the working man, peace among nations, and human happiness.

Who gained from all the changes effected in the Soviet Union under the leadership of the Communist Party? Who gained from the country's industrialisation, from the collectivisation of farming, from the establishment of socialist relations, from the preservation of peace, the development of economy and culture, from the higher living standard? There is only one answer—it was the masses, the workers, the peasants and the intelligentsia.

The working people learned from experience that the Communist Party has no other interests besides the people's interests. That is why the people trust the Communist Party implicitly and consider it their leader.

It is the fashion among bourgeois ideologists, a lasting though trivial fashion, to distort the role of the Communist Party in Soviet society. They claim, for example, that there is "contradiction" in the Programme of the C.P.S.U. On the one hand, they say, the Programme provides for a further extension of rights for the individual and greater individual freedoms for the Soviet citizen, yet on the other, it provides for an extension of the role of the Communist Party in the guidance of all social affairs.

This is typical of the bourgeois mentality, the bourgeois approach. Indeed, what bourgeois party would care about extending the freedoms of working people? No such bourgeois party has ever existed. The people wrest their rights and freedoms from the governing forces in fierce battles. Under capitalism, the rights of the ordinary man constitute a concession, not a gift of the bourgeoisie.

As for the Communists, they have no ideal greater than the ideal of welfare for the people, no purpose greater than the purpose of satisfying the people's needs, no task higher than the task of extending the people's rights and freedoms.

It was the Party that proclaimed the policy of developing socialist democracy as its main policy in the field of state affairs. What is more, the Party has lived up to this policy. It combats anarchy and bureaucratic abuses, which obstruct social progress generally and the development of socialist democracy in particular. The class roots of these and other phenomena inherent in the exploiting system have disappeared in the U.S.S.R. The class struggle has shifted to

the international scene. However, anarchy and bureaucratic abuses have not entirely disappeared. If they are not combated with enough determination, they are liable to inflict great damage upon communist construction and the interests of the people.

What we mean by anarchy in socialist conditions is the rejection by some people of the necessity of centralism. Parochialism and various survivals of nationalism are among the effects of this tendency. The fact that local organisations have been given greater powers is a good thing. Yet some local officials show a tendency from time to time to oppose incorrectly conceived local interests to the interests of the state as a whole, and in so doing they impair national economic progress and give precedence to the development of some one element of the economy.

The Party, strong in its unity, its unity of purpose and action, is quite able to combat these very dangerous centrifugal tendencies. The Party expresses the interests of all the nations, all the classes of socialist society, the interests of all its members. It is the mortar of the socialist system.

As for the bureaucratic abuses, they are a most harmful and enduring survival of the past, alien and hostile to the nature of socialism. Socialism presupposes the development of the initiative and voluntary effort of the masses. Bureaucracy, on the other hand, aims to entammel the initiative of the masses and fences off some of the officials from the people. Bureaucracy springs from an incorrect conception of the methods of communist construction, from gravitation towards directives and orders, compulsion and abuse. In his heart of hearts the bureaucrat has no faith in the masses. He treats their requirements and needs with disdain. Yet communism is the cause of the masses, led by the Party, and must enter the mind of every man.

The bureaucratic tendency seeks to emasculate the content of socialist democracy and to reduce its articulate forms to mere formalities, to substitute phrase-mongering for business-like discussions and prepared statements for fruitful exchanges of opinion. Formalism and indifference are the most dangerous features of bureaucracy at the present time. As before, the Communist Party is combating bureaucratic abuses, and marshaling all working people for this struggle.

It is the Communist Party, strong in its unity and in its

faith, that ensures further social progress and the development of socialist democracy. Essentially, the Party is not tied up with any departmental or professional interests, and has nothing in common with the spirit of parochialism and bureaucracy.

The Party sees to it that criticism and self-criticism by working people is exercised to promote communist construction. It stands firm on its Leninist principles. It is intolerant of defects and exposes them boldly for the benefit of the Soviet system. It is a voluntary union of the more advanced, politically conscious section of the working class, collective-farm peasantry and intelligentsia.

The role of the Party in socialist society is growing continuously. The Party equips the people with a clear scientific programme of advance and provides good leadership to economic and cultural development. Such scientific and political leadership is extremely important during the transition to communism.

Furthermore, in the process of communist construction ideological allegiance, high morals and a sense of duty, which gradually replace juridical regulation of people's activities, are particularly important. The Marxist-Leninist world outlook and communist morals, which are predominant under socialism, enter the consciousness of every person at the time of the transition to communism. The education of the man of the future, knowledgeable, enlightened and humane, for whom the welfare of communist society is the supreme rule, is one of the most vital tasks of communism. It is the basic provision for the final abolition of leadership by compulsion and its replacement by methods of persuasion. In this matter, too, the chief role belongs to the Party. In the struggle for the victory of communism, the Party lays an accent on persuasion, rather than on compulsion. In this sense its methods of leadership are a prototype for methods of administration in communist society. It tends to mould moral traits and traditions among its members that will ultimately triumph under communism, such as collectivism and mutual assistance, a strong sense of public duty and social responsibility, etc.

Replying to the fabrications of the bourgeois press concerning the growing role of the C.P.S.U. in the life of Soviet society, the late Palmiro Togliatti said:

"They noted and attacked the fact that the Party retains its functions as the body leading the country's economic and social affairs while it is assumed that the state withers away gradually. The reply to this should chiefly be that communist society is not, and cannot be, an anarchist society, and that it is and must be a highly organised society, with a stable technical basis. But it is no longer possible to achieve such organisation by economic and political compulsion. On the contrary, it must be the result of voluntary participation. Yet the difference between state and Party lies precisely in the fact that the state is chiefly an instrument of compulsion, while the Party is based on voluntary participation. Similarly, the principle of voluntary participation is also the basis of other organisations that are to discharge tasks now being discharged by the state. Furthermore, it should be borne in mind that in the Soviet Union the Party has always been, and will always be, the true leader of economic development in all matters concerning its general trend and the mobilisation of the masses."

Party guidance of socialist society, of all the processes in it, including the further development of socialist democracy, is the most important condition for successful communist construction.

SOURCES OF THE STRENGTH OF SOCIETY AND OF THE STATE

The C.C. report "On the Programme of the C.P.S.U." said that the development of the dictatorship of the proletariat into a state of the whole people does not in any way impair the strength of Soviet society and of the Soviet state. On the contrary, their strength multiplies, because new sources of strength supplement the old.

Coupled with the continuous growth of its economic potential, the social basis of the state has gained added strength and has expanded, and society has become united and monolithic. Therein lies the chief source of the strength of the state.

The opponents of the idea of the state of the whole people contend that the development of the dictatorship of the proletariat into a state of the whole people weakens Soviet power and Soviet society in the face of threats from abroad.

Such fears are absolutely groundless. In substance, this notion confuses the socialist and bourgeois conceptions of the sources of strength of a state.

Let us try to grasp what a source of strength implies? What state do we consider strong, and what state weak, and in what respects? On the face of it, these questions are simple. But if we go deeper, we will see that they are not simple at all. Different people, different classes, and different sections of people within those classes, understand the meaning of strength differently.

What do we mean by the strength of a man? If we do not give this question enough thought we may say that the man who can lift bigger weights, deliver a stronger punch or, generally, a man of greater physical strength, is the stronger.

But that is not all. It is not only his physical strength that makes a man strong. At present physical strength is secondary. A man's strength derives from his mental capacity, the strength of his spirit, his will power and his spiritual qualities. It is this strength that today helps man irrigate the deserts, navigate the seas, fly planes and penetrate into outer space.

As you see, even if applied to a man the question is not as simple as it looks. As for the strength of a state, it is still more complicated. People with a bourgeois mentality consider it a sign of strength if a state is able to coerce its citizens. "The bourgeoisie admit a state to be strong," Lenin wrote, "only when it can, by the whole might of the government apparatus, throw the masses wherever the bourgeois rulers want."¹

From the bourgeois point of view, a state that can precipitate the might of its machinery upon its subjects is a strong state, because it can at once disperse a demonstration, end a strike, evict people who have defaulted their rents, and make an unemployed keep silent. From the bourgeois point of view the McCarthy witchhunt in the United States some years ago, the police persecutions in West Germany, the mounting authoritarianism in France and the judicial abuses in Greece are all tokens of a strong state. Yet it is obvious that the contrary is true, for all these things are tokens of imperialist weakness. No longer is imperialism able to

¹ Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, Part 1, p. 336.

govern the masses in the old way, and to suppress their resistance.

The bourgeoisie believe that a state is strong if it is able to compel other states to do its bidding, if it is able to seize foreign land, plunder wealth abroad, and enslave other peoples.

The Marxists have a totally different idea of state strength. Strength should not be confused with violence. Those are entirely different things. One can be strong and not violent, and one can be violent and not strong. A state is stronger if it is not compelled to apply compulsion. It is doubly strong if it has the backing of its people, if its policies are just.

The conception of strength as pure violence and compulsion is deliberately disseminated by the exponents of capitalist exploitation in order to justify it. At other times it is the result of immature and primitive thinking. One should not rely on external signs, especially in social affairs. The spirit of the people, their moral unity, are extremely important factors on which the might of a socialist state depends. It is clear therefrom that any strengthening of the socialist state should not be considered as a strengthening of its compulsive activities. First and foremost, it presupposes an extension of its social basis, and greater confidence of the masses. Lenin wrote that the strength on which working-class power is based is not the strength of bayonets controlled by a handful of militarists, not the strength of police stations, not the strength of money. It is the strength derived from popular support.

"That," Lenin wrote, "is the basic difference of the new power from all the former bodies of old power."¹

The state, Lenin said, derives its strength from the political consciousness of the masses, from the fact that the masses are properly informed, that they discuss all things, and agree to them consciously. Hence, it derives its strength first and foremost from its democracy.

Speaking of the strengthening of the Soviet state, Lenin stressed time and again that it is essential to strengthen its social basis by developing socialist democracy. According to

¹ Lenin, "The History of the Question of Dictatorship", *Collected Works*, Vol. 31.

Lenin, the strengthening and development of Soviet power calls for the gradual enlistment of all working people in the administration of the state, for closer links between the machinery of state and the masses, for greater scope in selecting and withdrawing deputies, for a battle unto death with bureaucratic abuses and for the continued participation of all deputies in government, etc.

The Soviet state derives its strength from its enduring ties with the masses. The more conscious its citizens are, the more they trust their state, and the more fully does the state express their views and uphold their interests, the less need there is in compulsion for the solution of internal questions. This secures lasting unity between the people and the state and, consequently, strengthens the state very greatly.

What is the conclusion we can draw? The development of the dictatorship of the proletariat into a state of the whole people has, far from weakening Soviet society and Soviet power, strengthened them considerably. It also follows that the measures taken in the last few years to develop socialist democracy—enhancing the role of the representative bodies, enhancing the influence of public organisations, and extending direct democracy—have the effect of strengthening the Soviet state. The alliance of the working class and the peasantry, the unity of all Soviet people in the struggle for communism, the friendship of the peoples, are growing more solid and, therefore, Soviet society as a whole is gaining added strength.

The main source of strength of Soviet society and the Soviet state lies in the fact that the people, inspired by the ideas of Marx and Lenin, are firmly following the communist path. The people support the policy of the Party and the government, the policy of communism, the policy of peace, of all-round progress and welfare. This policy, in turn, derives its strength from the wisdom of the people, and its purpose is to express as fully as possible the interests, thoughts and hopes of the working people.

The ideological influence of the socialist state on people of the capitalist world springs from its moral strength. Communism is winning more and more people abroad to its side. It has entered the spiritual life of millions upon millions of people in the capitalist countries. Some support it fervently, others recognise its successes in some field while they are

sceptical about other fields, and yet others oppose it. But there are scarcely any people left today who are indifferent to communism. That is a sign of the times and, unquestionably, as time goes by, communism will continue winning fresh followers, because its successes in all fields of material and spiritual life are multiplying. That, too, is a source of strength for socialism.

Today, after the new Programme of the C.P.S.U. has been passed, the influence of communist ideas has grown many times over. The whole world has seen at first hand that the Soviet people have no goals other than peace on earth, international friendship, and development, development and more development in the name of man. People abroad are witnesses to the fact that the Soviet working class has freely given up its dictatorship and seen to it that democracy develops. It is not surprising therefore that the Programme of the C.P.S.U. was so enthusiastically welcomed even by those democratically minded people who do not entirely accept communist ideas.

To be sure, when speaking of the strength of the socialist state, other extremely important factors should not be overlooked. This applies to the economic potential. A state is all the stronger, the more developed is its economic basis. It is therefore clear that higher productivity of labour and expansion of socialist economy constitute a most important source of strength.

Economic development is essential not only for internal, but also for external reasons. It is necessary to win the economic competition with the capitalist countries and to add to the defensive potential of the socialist state.

The Soviet economy is growing at a much higher rate than that of the United States and of other highly developed capitalist countries. In the first four years of the current seven-year plan period Soviet industrial production increased by an annual average of 8.6 per cent, while that of the United States increased by approximately 2 per cent. This gives notice that socialism is sure to win the economic competition with capitalism.

Once the material and technical basis of communism is built, the possibilities for progress in Soviet society will expand very greatly, and consequently its strength too. The annual aggregate social product is expected to increase about

5-fold by 1980. Industrial output will increase at least 6-fold, and the aggregate farm output about 250 per cent. The economy will, in effect, have entirely new, up-to-date machinery by then. Soviet plant will be the most powerful, the newest and most efficient.

The task is realistic. The country is perfectly well equipped to fulfil it. It has ample production capacities, first-class technology, advanced science, inexhaustible natural resources, and competent personnel. Economic estimates show that the average annual accretion of industrial output in the coming period (up to 1980) will amount to not less than 9-10 per cent. This is quite enough to ensure the completion of the material and technical basis of communism within the set period, and thus, complete victory in the economic competition with capitalism.

The Party Programme has mapped out the basic trends of economic development—electrification of the whole country, comprehensive mechanisation and automation, development of the chemical industry, the fuel, iron and steel industries, and of new sources of power.

As concerns farming, it must yield an abundance of high-quality products for the population and of raw materials for industry.

Besides the moral and economic factors, the strength of a socialist state also implies continuous strengthening of the armed forces. Generally speaking, the communist ideal does not envisage violence. The Communists are working for a system (which they deeply believe is practicable) that will rule out compulsion of man by man and in which ultimately no state will exist. All people will comprise a united and friendly family, a large community in which every individual will be happy to give of all his energies to society.

The path to this lofty goal is difficult. Even after the exploiting classes are abolished within the country, socialist society cannot disarm unilaterally and give up its army, because the capitalist world has not abandoned the hope of destroying socialism. It is stockpiling weapons and waiting for an opportunity to use them.

Unhappily, the discovery of atomic fission has equipped people blinded by hatred for communism with barbaric means of annihilation. These are liable to inflict unheard-of losses to human society and civilisation.

The consequences of a world-wide thermonuclear war are unimaginable. A nuclear war would cause irreparable destruction to the productive forces and the cultural wealth. It would destroy hundreds of millions of people. Some nations would be wiped off the face of the earth. It would be a cataclysm, a terrible disaster for all mankind.

Yet the imperialists have not abandoned their inhuman designs. They are stockpiling hydrogen bombs and other weapons of mass annihilation. The post-war arms drive and economic militarisation in the imperialist countries proceed on an unprecedented scale. Suffice it to say that the NATO countries spent \$500,000 million on armaments in just the first ten years of that organisation.

Mankind needs to bridle imperialism. It needs to end the arms race. New butchery must be averted. The main force opposing imperialism and its savage plans of a nuclear war are the socialist countries. It is mostly due to their might, unity and persevering work for peace that a realistic opportunity has appeared in our time to prevent a nuclear world war. Such a war can be prevented if the socialist community, the international working class, the national liberation movement and all the peace-abiding nations pool their efforts.

Can the Soviet socialist state afford not to accumulate military power, not to accumulate weapons that will deter imperialism from making the fatal step to war? Every sober-minded person will see that it cannot. The Soviet state is compelled to reinforce its military potential continuously. As we see, the domestic situation has nothing to do with it. It is compelled to do so by the international situation. For the people democracy and for the enemy strength against strength. This is the motto of the Soviet people. In the meantime, capitalism employs strength mostly to maintain its rule over the working people within the country.

The Soviet Union is compelled to spend a substantial portion of its budget on military needs, on strengthening its Armed Forces and their firing power. It is very costly for the people, but it affords them tranquillity.

Speaking of the sources of strength of socialist society and of the socialist state, we must also list the *achievements of science and technology*. The scientific and technical revolution now in progress is based on automation, mechanisation, chemicalisation, electronics, and the peaceful use of

atomic energy. Never before did scientific discoveries so stimulate production. For this reason, the Soviet state takes vigorous measures to promote science and to train scientists and technicians. It will be recalled that the Soviet Union produces many more engineers annually than the United States. Soviet space flights speak of the fact that the Soviet Union is in the van of the scientific and technical revolution.

Now that we have established the elements that comprise the strength of socialist society and the socialist state, it is easy to see what adds to this strength and what does not. Strengthening the state does not mean strengthening compulsion with respect to its citizens. It does not mean strengthening the militia, the courts of law, and the rest of the legal machinery. It does not mean adding to their functions, adopting more severe provisions against offenders or regulating man's every step with rules and laws. That would conflict with the development of democracy, the main trend in the development of the Soviet state. The latter calls for something else, namely, greater initiative and greater voluntary public service by the masses.

Here is what strengthening the Soviet state chiefly means: broader democracy, the foundation of the people's unity; enhancement of the ideological influence of communism within and without the country, and, last but not least, economic progress. Greater unity, greater ideological influence and a greater economic potential—all these factors, beyond a doubt, constitute an objective, law-governed trend inherent in the nature of socialism.

As for the strengthening of Soviet military might, that has no connection with the nature of socialism. It is prompted by the international situation. Time and again, the Soviet Union has proposed that nuclear weapons be banned, that conventional armed forces be reduced, and that ultimately, armies and weapons be completely abolished. But the Soviet peace initiatives have not yet evoked the due response from the United States and other capitalist countries. So long as the latter persist in their imperialist policy, the Soviet state is compelled to see to its military potential, a most important factor of peace and security for the Soviet people and all the nations of the world.

The socialist revolution implies a deep-going transformation of society aimed at destroying all forms of exploitation,

and it is only natural that it calls to life a profusion of previously unknown forms of democracy.

When we speak of developing democracy, it should be taken for granted that we imply the development of *socialist forms* of political life, such forms as accord with the interests of the people and the goal of building communist society. All other trends conflict with the development of Soviet society, the interests of the people.

There is no line to be drawn between past, present and future forms of development as far as the Soviet state is concerned. The path of the new type of democracy born of the socialist revolution lies through the dictatorship of the proletariat to the state of the whole people, and onward to public communist self-government and the withering away of the state.

COMMUNIST SELF-GOVERNMENT IN THE MAKING

As socialist statehood develops, it will gradually become **communist self-government** of the people which will embrace the Soviets, trade unions, co-operatives, and other mass organisations of the people. . . . Historical development inevitably leads to the withering away of the state. To ensure that the state withers away completely, it is necessary to provide both internal conditions—the building of a developed communist society—and external conditions—the victory and consolidation of socialism in the world arena.

Programme of the C.P.S.U.

In the previous chapter we dealt with the trends followed lately in the development of the Soviet state—restoration of Leninist standards in the Party and the state, proper operation of all institutions of socialist democracy, enhancement of the rights of republican and local bodies of power and government, changes in the management of industry and agriculture, greater public initiative in the work of the Soviets of Working People's Deputies, enhanced role of the representative bodies, and transfer of some of the functions of the state to the trade unions and other public organisations. These and many other points show that the C.P.S.U. is laying the accent on the development of socialist democracy.

The Party does not consider its task completed in this respect. As noted at the 22nd Congress of the C.P.S.U. all-round development of the state of the whole people calls for a further far-reaching improvement of all the institutions of socialist democracy.

To show more clearly how the transition to public communist self-government will proceed, what the nature and forms of self-government will be, and what tendencies of present-day society will develop, let us recall how the Programme of the C.P.S.U. describes the future communist society. Clearly, the forms of self-government must accord

with the nature of that society, with its requirements, tasks and interests.

In the past, too, people tried to describe communist society. Suffering from the oppression of exploiters, they painted pictures of a future "golden age". Working people trusted that a society of justice, peace, equality and freedom, with no other ruler but labour, would come to replace slavery, dependence, abuse and poverty, the bitter struggle for the daily bread, and wars between nations.

Such Utopian Socialists as Tommaso Campanella, Thomas More, Claude-Henri Saint-Simon, Charles Fourier, Robert Owen, and such Russian revolutionary democrats as Herzen, Belinsky, Chernyshevsky and Dobrolyubov produced scathing and brilliant exposures of the exploiting system and its vices. The Utopians gave free rein to their imagination in depicting future society, and described its economics, culture, administration, morals and mode of life. Fourier fancied the ideal system as an alliance of phlanges, that is, production-consumer associations with an agrarian trend; Saint-Simon pictured it as a sum of associations dominated by industrialists and scientists; and Owen as model enterprises where incomes are distributed among all their workers. It is easy enough to pull all these theories to pieces, but what we want to stress is that below this cloak of fantasy, below these utopian socialist fancies, we now spot the embryo of genius.

The Utopians were unable to produce a scientific conception of communism. The undeveloped capitalist production of the time, the immature forms of social relations and class struggle could not produce anything but utopian socialist theory. The Socialist Utopians were much closer to the truth when they spoke of what there would not be in the future society than of what there would be. They were aware that none of the vices prevailing under capitalism would survive under the new system, but their notion of this new system was vague.

It was the founders of Marxism-Leninism who turned socialism from a Utopia into a science. The present generation of Communists owes them its clear conception of the ultimate goals and tasks. This is why, while giving due credit to the Utopian Socialists, the 22nd Congress of the C.P.S.U. turned its gaze fondly on Karl Marx, Frederick

Engels and Vladimir Lenin, the great teachers of the world proletariat, whose scientific and revolutionary feat will live down the ages. It was they who worked out the authentic theory of communism, who charted the course to the new society and defined the revolutionary forces that would destroy the old world and build the world of socialism and communism.

The present conception of the communist system is based entirely on the scientific conclusion of Marx, Engels and Lenin. Yet in one very substantial respect the present-day Communists have an unquestionable advantage. They possess the immense and invaluable practical experience of building socialism and communism.

The experience of socialist construction in the Soviet Union and in other European and Asian socialist countries provides a wealth of material for a mind picture of the future communist society, which not only the Socialist Utopians but also the great founders of scientific communism lacked.

To be sure, it is impossible even now to conceive full-scale communist society in every detail. The Communist Party acts on the wise caution of its teachers, Marx, Engels and Lenin, who never gave any but the most reasoned answers about the future system. They were fond of saying that they were leaving it to the following generation to complete their theoretical work. And the modern Communists, in their turn, are leaving it to the people of the future to add the finishing touches to the picture of the future society.

However, already now the Programme of the C.P.S.U. produces a clear conception of the future society, because the trends of development of socialist society, which in consummation will bring about the victory of communism, have become distinct.

"Communism," says the Programme, "is a classless social system with one form of public ownership of the means of production and full social equality of all members of society; under it, the all-round development of people will be accompanied by the growth of the productive forces through continuous progress in science and technology; all the springs of co-operative wealth will flow more abundantly, and the great principle, 'from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs', will be implemented."

The experience of socialist construction confirms the conclusion drawn by Marx and Engels that communism can only be built on the basis of a broad development of the productive forces, above all large-scale machine industry. At present, this idea is taken for granted, but in its day it was a scientific discovery. It was advanced in opposition to the Socialist Utopians who, as a rule, mistrusted the big-scale production developed by capitalism and called for a return to small-scale home industry. In our time, the time of precipitous scientific and technical progress, the words of Frederick Engels, who said that the technical basis of large-scale industry was revolutionary, have a contemporaneous ring.

In defining the main tasks of communist construction, the Programme of the C.P.S.U. takes the cue from the brilliant formula of Lenin, "Communism is Soviet power plus the electrification of the whole country". This formula is applied specifically in the Programme to the achievements of modern science and technology, with an eye to the scientific and technical revolution proceeding in our time. The programme of building the economic basis of communism presents the struggle for an abundance of consumer commodities, this essential condition for communist distribution according to needs, in terms of concrete calculations and practical tasks.

Communism is a society with highly organised production directed from one centre. It may be recalled that most Socialist Utopians imagined it as a system of restricted, self-contained phlanges and communities but poorly connected with each other in the economic and social sense. Saint-Simon was an exception. His ideas about the general development of the economy are, undoubtedly, among the most truthful and profound ideas of Utopian Socialism. Yet it was the founders of Marxism-Leninism who envisaged centralised production and its administration according to a single plan, which they regarded as one of the decisive advantages of the new system.

It is clearer than ever today that communist society calls more than any other for efficient centralised economic planning, organised distribution of labour and regulation of working time with consideration for the distinctive features of the various production processes. This stems from the requirements of development, from the mounting scale of production, from the close inter-relation of the various eco-

conomic fields, from continuous technical progress, and from the communist principles of distribution and consumption. Planning economic and social processes, one of the biggest accomplishments of human progress, is sure to be extended in every way under communism.

Continuous economic growth and the striving to enhance the productivity of social labour call objectively for ever broader forms of country-wide democratic government. Only then will centralised planning and management yield the maximum of benefit. Active participation of the whole people in economic management is a reliable guarantee for conclusive and correct solutions. It enhances the proficiency and cultural level of the masses and their interest in the results of production.

The Programme of the C.P.S.U. emphasises that communism is a highly organised society of free and conscious working people, with public self-government, where work for the common benefit will for all become the prime vital requirement, a necessity recognised by one and all and where the ability of each person will be employed to the greatest benefit of the people.

Communism is a classless society. To create such a society it is necessary to overcome the class distinctions between workers and peasants and the essential distinctions between town and country, to pave the way for an organic fusion of manual and mental labour. This society will take shape through the further rapid growth of the productive forces, and the rise of technical and cultural knowledge among the working people. On the basis of the highly developed productive forces, the property of the whole people and the co-operative form of property will gradually merge, culminating in one type of communist property and a single, communist principle of distribution, which is essential for the final eradication of class distinctions.

Eradication of distinctions between classes now proceeding in the Soviet land is leading to an increasing degree of social homogeneity and the complete social equality of people—to communist equality. Such equality will imply identical relations to the means of production, complete equality in distribution, and harmonious development of the individual.

The materials and decisions of the 22nd Congress, as well as the Programme of the C.P.S.U., for the first time set out the specific ways of realising the great slogan of the Communists, "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs". The way to realise the principles of communist equality is to combine material stimuli for labour with increasing distribution through the public consumption fund.

The C.P.S.U. envisages that by 1980 the standard of living in the U.S.S.R. will be higher than in any capitalist country.

Under communism, society will undertake to satisfy all the requirements of man. Special stress will be laid on the extension of the public consumption fund, designed to satisfy the needs of the members of society regardless of the quantity and quality of their work, that is, free of charge (education, medical treatment, pensions, maintenance of children in children's institutions, etc.), which is already being realised during the transition to communism.

That every individual should have the material and cultural blessings to match his increasing requirements, is the main but not the only goal of communism. When satisfying the requirements of man will no longer be a problem, man himself, his all-round spiritual growth and moral improvement, become the purpose of social progress.

In his day, Fourier observed that man's highest faculties come to the surface in his passion for creation. That is quite true. The faculty of creation, the urge for knowledge, those are the most valuable faculties in man. It is these faculties that will flourish under communism. Communism will usher in a time of accomplishments that will dwarf even the greatest of the achievements of our time.

The coming period (until 1980) is a period of crucial importance for the progress of Soviet society and the development of all mankind. It is in that period that communist society will in the main be built in the U.S.S.R.

This means, firstly, that in the economic field the country will have built the material and technical basis of communism. The Soviet Union will surpass the economic level of the most developed countries and forge ahead of all in production per head of population, securing the world's highest

living standard and paving the way for the achievement of abundance of material and cultural blessings.

Secondly, in the field of social relations the still existing distinctions between classes will gradually vanish, the classes will merge into a classless society of working people. The essential distinctions between town and country will be removed in the main, and then also between people of manual and mental labour. The economic and ideological community of nations will be enhanced. The features of the man of communist society, who will harmoniously combine a profound sense of good, broad knowledge, moral purity and physical perfection, will develop.

Thirdly, in the political sense all citizens will participate in the administration of public affairs and as a result of the development of socialist democracy society will prepare itself for the full realisation of the principles of communist self-government.

ALL MUST PARTICIPATE IN ADMINISTRATION

It is the cherished ideal of the Communists to attract all citizens to the administration of social affairs. In the present conditions this ideal looms as an immediate practical task. The living conditions of all working people will continuously improve. The forms of popular representation and the principles of the Soviet election system will be perfected. The practice of country-wide discussion of the major issues of communist construction will develop. All these factors will promote the main task. So will the development of popular control over the bodies of power and government, and the principle of election, accountability and renewal of leading officials in the state machinery and the public organisations, with the ultimate object of applying the same principles to all the leaders.

Even now we see the forms of self-government that will prevail in the future appear, take strength and develop. Here are a few examples of how the conditions are laid for the transition to communist public self-government. There are some two million deputies to the various Soviets in the country. That is in itself a very imposing figure. If we add more than two million activists working on the various standing

committees under the Soviets, it becomes still more imposing. Then, take the millions of citizens active in the various street and house committees, the people's *druzhinas*¹, etc. All this shows that self-government is not a remote day-dream, but a clear-cut tendency in Soviet society, and that it is being advanced.

In the last few years some of the paid officials under the Soviets have been replaced by people doing work as a public service. In Sverdlovsk Region, for example, some 140 departments of local executive committees operate on the public service principle.

Some of the functions in production are performed on a volunteer basis. The factories in the country have more than 10,000 designing and technological offices staffed by volunteers, who devote their leisure to them. In addition, there are 2,000 economic analysis centres and 760 technical information bureaux working on the same principle. And here is an example from a different field, one closely associated with the interests of the working people—mass control of housing distribution and public control of retail trade, performed by some six million trade union activists.

It is wrong to say, however, that the transition to self-government hinges chiefly on the principle of unpaid volunteer work. The transition to unpaid public services should be attended by a palpable improvement of the administration. Secondly, it is essential that the people performing such unpaid administrative functions should be continuously controlled by the masses, elected by the masses, and replaced from time to time. The main thing is to attract the masses employed at factories, at research and other institutions, to the administration of factories and institutions at which they are employed and to the administration of the district, region or republic concerned, and to the country as a whole. The Programme of the C.P.S.U. defines the essentials for this.

The first thing to do, the Programme notes, *is to enhance the role of the Soviets*, which are all-embracing organisations of the people, the embodiment of their unity. On the one hand, their role is to be enhanced by extending their powers, which will probably tend to make the sessions of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. and the republican and local

¹ Squads of volunteers for the maintenance of law and order.

Soviets longer and more frequent. This will enable them to cope with the increased amount of work, to thoroughly examine the laws and decisions, and to exercise effective control over the various ministries and departments.

On the other hand, the contribution of every deputy to government will increase, and so will the bonds between the deputies and their electors. This is presaged, among other things, by the fact that the sessions of Soviets now take place more often at collective and state farms, and at factories. It is also presaged by the reports which executive committees, standing committees and heads of factories and offices make to the population.

The enhanced role of the deputy as an individual invested by the people with powers of administering the affairs of society has always been considered a most important condition for the transition to self-government. Small wonder then that, back at the dawn of the Revolution, the leaders of the Party and the Soviet state attached special importance to the Soviets. Here are some of the measures envisaged in the Party Programme adopted by the 8th Congress of the C.P.S.U. in 1919 for the development of socialist democracy:

"1) Every member of the Soviet must on all accounts perform a definite job in the administration of the state. 2) This work must be successively changed so that gradually it would embrace all fields of administration. 3) All working people must gradually be, to a man, drawn into the work of administering the state."

The new Programme has developed these ideas. It says:

"Every deputy to a Soviet must take an active part in government affairs and carry on definite work."

It speaks of enhancing the role of the standing committees of the Supreme Soviets. They are to control the activities of ministries, departments and economic councils, and must actively contribute to the implementation of the decisions adopted by the respective Supreme Soviets. Deputies, says the Programme, will have to be periodically released from their regular employment for committee work. This will help them to participate actively in the work of the legislative bodies, in administration and control.

The elective bodies of the Soviets and public organisations are assuming not only the functions of general administration, but also the immediate administration of various sides

of public life, and extending their control over the machinery of government. An increasing number of questions now in the competence of boards and executive committee departments are being gradually referred to the standing committees of local Soviets.

It is becoming possible now for district and village Soviets to settle all the basic matters at their sessions or to let their committees do it, while the executive committees and their various departments execute these decisions under the control of the committees. This trend will be accompanied by promotion of unpaid public work in the various departments and boards of the Soviets.

The Party stressed in its Programme that democratic principles must be observed in the work of the Soviets. The principle of accountability by the Soviets and their deputies to the electorate should be enforced in full, and so must the right of the electorate to recall deputies who have fallen down on their duties before their term expires. Information, and free and exhaustive discussion at Soviet sessions of all the important questions of government and of economic and cultural growth must be provided for. So must regular accounts by the executive bodies to the sessions of Soviets at all levels, and other standards in the activity of Soviet bodies in power.

The Programme of the C.P.S.U. notes the necessity of developing the *democratic principles of the Soviet electoral system*. During the nomination of candidates for the Soviets, a broad and exhaustive discussion of their personal and general qualities must be ensured at meetings and in the press. This will help, in all cases, to elect the most capable and worthy deputies.

The Party considers it necessary to advance the principles of *local self-government*. The development of democracy during the transition to communism is bound up with an extension of the rights of local bodies and local collectives. It is self-evident that this extension of rights has its limits, depending on the interests of the nation as a whole and on the necessity of directing and guiding the basic economic and socio-political processes, of planning these processes, from one centre. However, these limits have not been reached. The republics have indeed acquired broad enough powers in many spheres of life, but this does not apply to the

regional, district, and village bodies of power, and especially to factory and other primary organisations. Yet the effectiveness of the policy of extending local rights depends chiefly on the extent to which this will affect the primary bodies and the immediate producers. It is most of all their initiative and their voluntary efforts that, in the final analysis, secure higher productivity of labour and more rapid rates of social development.

As the co-operative type of property fuses more with the property of the whole people, a single democratic organ administering all factories, offices and organisations of a local scale will gradually take shape.

The Programme of the C.P.S.U. stresses that the matters to be placed under the competence of the primary collectives and organisations will increase in number. Even today, the local Soviet has competence over problems on which its decisions cannot be repealed by any superior organisation (provided it does not violate any existing laws).

The Soviets will clearly have closer ties with the economic councils. This will promote democracy in the country's economic management.

The functions of representative bodies and their activities in communist construction will grow continuously. The Soviets have the best opportunities of drawing all working people into the work of administration. It is mostly through them that the Party exercises its leadership over all the economic and social processes in society.

The transition to public communist forms of administration also calls for *improvement of the forms and methods of economic management*. Unquestionably, the bigger role to be played by Party, trade union and other public organisations will not only make for better operation of factories and farms, but will also pave the way to a gradual replacement of state forms of economic management with public forms.

The Programme of the C.P.S.U. emphasises the need of enhancing the role of the workers and other employees in treating questions related to the operation of their enterprises.

The time has come to extend the democratic principles of economic management. The collective of a modern Soviet enterprise constitutes a strong social force consisting of

skilled and educated workers, engineers and technicians. This social force could and should participate more actively in the management of production.

It was decided that enterprises and building projects should have production committees, which are broadly representative bodies elected at general meetings of the personnel. These committees participate in the discussion of the production plan, they control its fulfilment, help to set work quotas and assist in selecting personnel. The main purpose of these committees is to attract a larger number of employees to the management of the enterprise.

The decision of forming production committees is consistent with the Leninist principles of management, which imply harmonious combination of centralism with broadly democratic principles.

It is also contemplated to extend the rights of enterprises and building projects to a point where the superior central organisation would retain the minimum of powers essential to manage the economic branch concerned, or the economy as a whole.

This extension of rights of enterprises and building projects will tend to invigorate centralised planning and to concentrate it on the main trends of development.

The Communist Party attaches special importance to the perfection of planning. The main thing in planning now is to ensure conditions for a rational and effective use of material and financial resources, manpower, the natural wealth, new technology and techniques, and to do away with extravagance and waste.

The only reliable and effective way to improve planning, the Party believes, is to put the administrative machinery, the planning agencies included, under the constant control of the masses. If the masses participate in management and planning, production is sure to develop with the maximum efficiency.

The powers and responsibilities of the various republican agencies with regard to economic management and planning are to increase, since planning and the fulfilment of plans is now assigned to the republican authorities.

The new organisation of planning connotes a further development of the principle of centralisation, coupled with greater rights for the constituent republics and local bodies.

Most of all, it connotes greater scope for the creative initiative of the working people.

But the search for the most effective and desirable forms of combining centralism in the main issues with broad independence for the enterprises and local bodies will continue as the economy grows, the personnel gets more proficient and the workers and peasants acquire greater skills.

Improvement of the work of the state machinery and the extension of voluntary public services is one of the most important conditions for the success of communist construction. The machinery of state must be simple in structure, competent, not too costly, efficient, it must eliminate red tape, formalism and procrastination.

Control by the people is a splendid way for improving Party and government guidance, consolidating the bonds between the Party and the working people, and drawing the masses into the administration of society's affairs.

Lenin attached immense importance to the proper organization of control. In his *How We Should Reorganise the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection and Better Fewer, but Better*, which he wrote in the latter years of his life, Lenin worked out the principles of control in the Soviet state. The main thing, he always stressed, is to combine Party and government control, and to attract people from all sections of the population to implement this control.

At present, Lenin's principles of control, forsaken at the time of the Stalin cult, are not only being revived, but are also being developed in application to present conditions. An effective system of control has been created from top to bottom, based on a combination of Party and government control with the closest and immediate participation of the people. The purpose of the newly established Committee of Party and Government Control goes far beyond ordinary control, and pivots chiefly on promoting all forms of public activity designed to combat abuses and offenses and to rectify errors in the work of the state machinery. The Party believes that people's control is an effective way of enlisting mass participation in the administration of the state, a way of improving the machinery of the state, of rooting out red tape and promptly carrying out the recommendations and proposals coming from working people.

This is how Lenin envisaged it. "The task of the Workers'

and Peasants' Inspection," Lenin wrote, "is not only, and not so much, to 'catch' and 'bring to book' (that is for the courts to do, with which the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection may be contiguous, but not at all identical), and much rather in *being able to reform*. Mending, rectifying, and reforming, if done skilfully and in good time, is the chief purpose of the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection."¹

The machinery of state serves the people. Therefore, stresses the Programme of the C.P.S.U., dishonest officials, abuse of power and red tape should be combated firmly, and offenders should be punished severely, regardless of their rank.

The Communist Party concentrates on the task of fighting red tape in state and public organisations, for red tape retards the advance to communist society. It combats people who abuse and violate the rights and interests of the Soviet citizen. Any citizen of the Soviet Union whose rights have been violated by an official has every opportunity of fighting that official not only through administrative channels, but through courts of law. This restores justice and lays material and other responsibilities on the offending officials.

In listing the measures designed to attract the masses to the administration of the affairs of state, the Programme of the C.P.S.U. calls attention to the further *improvement of the judiciary*. "The democratic foundations of justice will be developed and improved," says the Programme.

It will be recalled that Lenin attached great significance to the participation of the masses in court proceedings. Lenin believed that ultimately all people should bear a share of the responsibility for the exercise of justice in the country. He believed that this was one of the ways of drawing the people into the administration of the state. The higher level of communist consciousness and culture makes greater popular representation in the exercise of justice possible and, moreover, necessary.

The Programme lays an accent on consistent realisation of the Leninist *principle of electiveness, accountability and the right of recall of officials*. Lenin believed that election and right of recall were a salient feature of socialist democracy, that they were one of the means leading to the transforma-

¹ Lenin, *The Tasks of the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection, Their Interpretation and Fulfilment*, Vol. 33.

tion of the state "into something which is no longer really the state", one of the measures preventing officials from turning into bureaucrats.¹

Experience shows that judicious promotion is highly important in the socialist state, which controls all the main levers guiding economic and social processes. Much depends on the people in high offices, and there should be the most painstaking, thorough and democratic selection, and most effective and constant control by the people over the individuals elected.

The Programme of the C.P.S.U. lists a set of measures to increase the number of people with experience in government, in order to enhance the Leninist principle of collective leadership and to secure a broader influx of fresh strength to the bodies of state. This will facilitate measures preventing excessive concentration of power in the hands of individual officials and the possibility of their escaping public control.

The Programme of the C.P.S.U. says:

"To improve the work of the Soviets and bring fresh forces into them, it is advisable that at least one-third of the total number of deputies to a Soviet should be elected anew each time so that *fresh millions of working people may learn to govern the state.*

"The Party considers *systematic renewal of the leading bodies* necessary to bring a wider range of able persons into them and rule out abuses of authority by individual government officials. It is advisable to introduce the principle that the leading officials of the Union, republican and local bodies should be elected to their offices, as a rule, for not more than three consecutive terms. In those cases when the personal gifts of the official in question are generally believed to make his further activity within a leading body useful and necessary, his re-election may be allowed. His election shall be considered valid if not a simple majority, but not less than three-quarters of the votes are cast in his favour."

The principle of electiveness, as envisaged in the Programme of the C.P.S.U., will gradually spread to encompass all the officials of the administrative machinery. It is likely that in many cases offices, especially offices in the economy, would be filled by contest.

¹ See Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, pp. 335, 391.

Administration is a science and no administrator will be good if he has not learned it. Lenin stressed this fact dozens of times. He called on the officials to learn the art of administration thoroughly.

It is an art which one learns mostly by practice. This practice may differ in scale, in character and importance. One might, say, be a people's assessor in court, or control public catering, or yet be a deputy to a Soviet. In that sense, any worker or peasant may take part in handling the affairs of state. But training in the theory of administration is also vastly important. Officials employed in ministries, departments, economic councils, etc., cannot do without it.

The Party has reminded all managers, managerial personnel, that they must on all accounts extend and refresh their knowledge of economy, for without it competent management is inconceivable. An accent is laid on knowledge in the field of the state and law for officials of the state machinery. Officers of the court and prosecution must, naturally, have a legal education. Law and security officers also need a legal education. So do all the employees in the Ministry of Justice and many of the employees of the Soviets.

A certain amount of knowledge in the field of government and administration is also essential for economic managers. Many managerial problems are tied up with economic and legal sciences—such as incentives, wages, the administrative structure and its methods of operation, distribution of functions, rights and duties among the various agencies and between officials, the proper combination of centralisation and local initiative, collective leadership and individual authority, etc.

The measures envisaged in the Programme will, unquestionably, greatly promote socialist democracy and raise it to a new, higher level. During the transition to communism the electiveness principle will gradually spread to all the leading offices. No longer will people have to engage continuously and exclusively in administration and management. Such work will in the long run cease to be a specific profession.

"The further *promotion of socialist law and order*," says the Programme of the C.P.S.U., "and the improvement of legal rules governing economic organisation, cultural and educational work and contributing to the accomplishment of

the tasks of communist construction and to the all-round development of the individual are very important."

The Soviet state devotes much of its attention to safeguarding legality and the rights of citizens. In doing so, it promotes public participation in combating various violations of legality.

During the transition to communism legality must be further strengthened. The more fully it reflects the daily needs, the deeper it penetrates the consciousness of every citizen, the more thoroughly the ground will be prepared for the gradual transformation of law into such standards of life as will, without compulsion, rule out offenses solely on the basis of public consciousness and public opinion. Further improvement of the laws and other legal norms is therefore extremely important.

Observance of laws and other regulations prescribed by Soviet power is vital for the Party, the state and the people as a whole, because these laws express the people's will and aspirations. Maintenance of legality springs from the democratic nature of the Soviet state. People holding public offices and all other citizens must perform the public will expressed through the laws. At the same time, legality stands guard over the centralism of the state machinery, for it makes the decisions of superior bodies binding on the inferior ones.

From the first, the Soviet state pronounced the need to observe all Soviet laws. The importance of legality was stressed time and again in later years. That is only natural. Whenever the progressive classes worked to seize power, they always were critics and opponents of the order maintained by their predecessors. But once they took power, they naturally became fervent advocates of the order they themselves established. The bourgeoisie fought the feudal system when it was still a progressive class. It opposed the laws of the feudals, and upheld its own. And the proletariat did likewise in its struggle against the bourgeoisie. A class holding power securely does not need to violate its own laws. It has the authority to repeal or replace them with new ones whenever it needs to.

Codification of Soviet laws is the key to legality. What legality needs is stable, good, clear and publicly known laws. At the same time, legality depends greatly on how well the people appreciate its necessity and what they do to main-

tain order in all matters. This applies particularly to people in office, who are authorised to decide the big and small affairs of state.

Further *enhancement of the role of public organisations* is another highly important trend in the development of democracy. At the same time, it is a vital condition for the transition to public communist self-government.

The section of the Programme specially devoted to the enhancement of the role of public organisations lays strong emphasis on extending the influence of trade unions. That is natural, too. The trade unions are the most massive organisation of workers and other employees. Lenin described them as a school of administration, a school of management, a school of communism. Millions of people go through this school and develop into prominent managers and statesmen.

It is obvious that the existing forms in which the masses participate through the trade unions in the management of production and culture will expand and develop.

Here, by and large, is the way the Programme defines the tasks of the trade unions. The trade unions are to:

"work constantly to increase the communist consciousness of the masses; organise the emulation movement for communist labour and help the working people in learning to manage state and social affairs; take an active part in controlling the measure of labour and the measure of consumption;

"encourage the activity of factory and office workers, enlisting their aid in the work for continuous technical progress, for higher productivity of labour, for the fulfilment and overfulfilment of state plans and assignments;

"work steadfastly for the improvement of the skill of factory and office workers and their working and living conditions; protect the material interests and rights of the working people;

"ensure that housing and cultural development plans are fulfilled and that public catering, trade, social insurance, and health resort services are improved;

"ensure control over the spending of public consumption funds and over the work of all enterprises and institutions serving the people;

"improve cultural services and recreation facilities for the working people; encourage physical training and sports."

The Young Communist League will have to increase its role and influence on society considerably. It is a helper of the Party. It helps to educate the youth in the communist spirit and to enlist it in the building of new society. The people who will live in communist society must be harmoniously developed and highly cultured. It is the League's task to develop generations of such people.

The role of other social groups and associations, scientific and technical societies, unions of writers, art workers, and people of other professions is to expand as well. The Programme of the C.P.S.U. envisages a set of measures designed to enhance the importance of public organisations in the life of society. In the foreseeable future already the latter will participate to a far greater extent in legislation. The trade unions, the Young Communist League and other mass organisations will soon be invested with the right of legislative initiative. In other words, any one of these organisations will be allowed to submit draft laws to the legislative bodies, which these latter will be obliged to examine and discuss.

Public organisations will be invested with more functions previously performed by bodies of state. In a few years the management of public entertainment, clubs and cultural institutions now controlled by the state, will be transferred to the public organisations. Naturally, new forms of public management will then evolve, completely or almost completely based on unpaid volunteer work. The people's organisations that help to maintain public order, especially the people's *druzhinas* and the comradely courts, will become still more effective. A larger number of people will participate in their work.

The Programme of the C.P.S.U. shows how the work of the public organisations is to be improved. The transfer of various functions and powers to them will not be beneficial unless the activities of the public organisations will follow democratic lines based on the principle of unpaid public service. Their salaried staffs will be reduced and their elective bodies will be renewed at regular intervals. The Programme envisages that roughly one-half of the members of the elected bodies will be renewed through regular elections. The leading functionaries are not to be elected for more than two consecutive terms.

It is wrong to think, however, that the transition to public self-government will proceed solely through the transfer of one state function after another, and ultimately of all functions, to the public organisations. There is reason to believe that this will happen in a different way. The Soviets, trade unions, co-operatives, and other mass organisations will in concert assume the functions of communist self-government. This implies that public democratic principles will gain ascendancy in all these organisations as time goes on. That seems to be how the road is paved for the transition to self-government.

Here is a legitimate question: How can the role of the Soviet organs and the public organisations increase at one and the same time? Does not transfer of some of the functions of state to public organisations reduce the role of the Soviets?

Let us answer these questions. The public organisations will assume functions previously performed by the executive or even the administrative machinery. Yet the Soviet executive machinery is not opposed to the people, as in the capitalist countries. The Soviet machinery of government is of and for the people, and is continuously controlled by the masses. Yet the transfer of some of its functions to the population and the public organisations will improve matters, because the more people participate in government, the more active they are, the more effective and fruitful it becomes.

As for the representative bodies, the Soviets, they will not only retain the powers of guiding all the processes in Soviet society, but will obtain added powers. Lenin always stressed that the Soviets are bodies in which all the threads of government are concentrated.

The fact that the further development of socialist democracy continuously increases the immediate participation of every citizen in state affairs is of immense significance. It implies, first and foremost, that the chief laws of the state and all the economic plans are discussed by the entire population before being passed. Furthermore, it implies that the immediate participation of citizens in government grows bigger, because the Soviets and the public organisations become more active. The transfer to the public organisations of some of the functions of state and the enhanced role of the Soviets pave the way to communist self-government. Devel-

opment of direct democracy facilitates and promotes the participation of all citizens in the affairs of state.

In communist society, too, the public functions of economic and cultural management now performed by the state, will remain. But they will be improved and will assume a different character, in keeping with the degree of social development. No longer will they have a political complexion, and the entire population will be drawn into them. For a certain time state guidance and public self-government will combine. And it will be under communism only that the state will wither away and give place completely to public self-government.

THE WITHERING AWAY OF THE STATE

In a general way, Marx and Engels have more than a hundred years ago explained what they meant by the withering away of the state and what conditions would induce this process.

They first proved scientifically that the state is not eternal, and thereby repudiated one of the most enduring bourgeois dogmas. We shall not here reproduce the arguments made by Marx and Engels. They may be found in such works by Frederick Engels as *Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State* and *Anti-Dühring*. Let us just recall the economic, social and political conditions which the founders of Marxism associated with the withering away of the state.

By the withering away of the state Marx and Engels meant the removal of the special machinery of compulsion, of public political power. They approached this problem, like all other problems, very realistically. They did not indulge in fantasy like their forerunners, the Utopian Socialists. To be sure, it is always very tempting to try and look into the remote future. But the attempt the Utopians made to picture it in all its details ended mostly in one thing: the future looked to them simply as a negation of their present.

Unlike the Utopians, Marx and Engels deduced their conception of communism from the realities, from the existing tendencies in social development. We shall not therefore find any detailed description in their works of public self-government under communism. The founders of Marxism

forecast the inevitable withering away of the state with scientific precision and defined the key symptoms of this process.

They considered development of the productive forces to an extent that will make public wealth pour in a torrent and realise the principle of communism, "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs", to be the economic premise for the withering away of the state. There will then be no need any longer to safeguard the principles of distribution by compulsory means.

They considered the abolition of exploiting classes and the disappearance of all classes as the chief social condition for the withering away of the state. They predicted that once social distinctions between people disappear, bodies of state will no longer be necessary. No social contradictions will then remain to be resolved through the coercive actions of the state. People will gradually grow accustomed to observing the rules of social living without compulsion.

Marx and Engels associated the withering away of the state with a stage in self-government when all citizens without exception would participate in the administration of the affairs of society. This presupposes the moulding of the new man, one who appreciates public interests, one imbued with a sense of genuine humanity and fraternity, and one possessing extensive knowledge and culture. Communist morals and ethics, the classics of scientific communism averred, will ultimately replace the laws and regulations established by the state.

Here is one of the most revealing statements made by Engels about the withering away of the state. "As soon as there is no longer any social class to be held in subjection," he said, "as soon as class rule, and the individual struggle for existence based upon our present anarchy in production, with the collisions and excesses arising from these, are removed, nothing more remains to be repressed, and a special repressive force, a state, is no longer necessary. The first act by virtue of which the state really constitutes itself as the representative of the whole of society—the taking possession of the means of production in the name of society—is, at the same time, its last independent act as a state. State interference in social relations becomes, in one domain after another, superfluous, and then withers away of itself; the government of persons is replaced by the administration of

things, and by the conduct of processes of production. The state is not 'abolished'. *It withers away.*"¹

Marx and Engels assumed that socialism would win at once in all or most of the capitalist countries. In these circumstances the danger of war would disappear completely. Peace would be secure. Naturally, they regarded the withering away of the state solely from the angle of society's internal development, divorced from the international factor. So they drew the conclusion that all functions of the state would wither away under communism, including the function of defence from aggression.

However, history has proceeded differently. Socialism won at first in one country, the Soviet Union. This confirmed Lenin's brilliant conclusion that it is possible to build socialism in one country, which he made after analysing the contradictions of imperialism in the specific Russian environment.

The fact that socialism was first built in one country and existed in a capitalist encirclement, altered the problem of the withering away of the state. The Soviet state was compelled to reckon with the existence of external dangers. The withering away of the state no longer depended on just the internal conditions, but also on the international situation.

The emergence of new socialist states, of the mighty socialist community, has injected new elements into social life on earth. The balance of forces between socialism and capitalism on the world scene has changed. The possibility appeared of preventing world war. But the danger of an attack on the U.S.S.R. and other socialist countries remains. The imperialist countries continue the arms drive, stockpile weapons of mass annihilation, and do not abandon the hope of destroying socialism. This compels the socialist countries to strengthen their defensive potential to the utmost, to maintain a strong army and navy, armed with the latest weapons and able to repel any aggressive attack. It is obvious that today, too, the withering away of the state in the U.S.S.R. does not depend only on processes within the country, but also to a large extent on the external factor.

Does this mean that the whole process of the withering away of the state has been shelved by history until a time when socialism will have gained complete predominance in

¹ Frederick Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, p. 387.

the world and the danger of an outside attack will have been removed? No, it does not. A distinction should be made between the beginning of this process, its development, and its culmination.

The international situation has a bearing on the definition of the external functions of the state. So long as the threat of an aggression by any one of the imperialist states persists, the function of defence remains and the armed forces have to be kept intact. This function will not wither away until socialism wins all over the world. It follows that the withering away of the state will not end until full communist society is achieved, the above-mentioned economic and social conditions become reality and the danger of a foreign attack disappears. "For the state to wither away completely," Lenin said, "full communism is necessary."¹ But the process, as such, begins long before communism triumphs.

As concerns the internal functions of the state, such as the administration of economy and culture, education of citizens, regulation of the measure of labour and consumption, etc., these depend mostly on the domestic conditions in which socialist society develops. But to some extent they depend also on the international situation.

Consequently, the withering away of state functions should be examined part by part—the internal functions in isolation from the external functions. That was how Lenin approached the matter, in view of the possibility of socialist revolution and socialist construction in one country. Lenin associated the withering away of the state primarily with the internal conditions of the development of socialist society—abolition of exploiting classes and classes generally, the enforcement of the communist principle of distribution, education of new generations in the communist spirit, development of public organisations, and other forms of democracy.

The C. C. report on the Programme of the C.P.S.U. to the 22nd Congress took these ideas a step further. "For some time," it said, "the features of state administration and public self-government will intermingle. In this process the domestic functions of the state will develop and change, and gradually lose their political character. It is only after a

¹ Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, p. 378.

developed communist society is built in the U.S.S.R., and provided socialism wins and consolidates in the international arena, that there will no longer be any need for the state, and it will wither away."

The order in which the various functions will wither away and, accordingly, the order in which the bodies of state will change or wither away, is difficult to predict.

Lenin presumed that the internal conditions for the withering away of the state will mature sooner than the external, and that socialism would win in the U.S.S.R. before the capitalist system vanishes from the face of the earth. Lenin believed for this reason that the domestic economic functions of the state will wither away sooner than the army and navy, which will still be required to safeguard the country from external dangers.

Today, four decades later, we see how right Lenin was. History has dated the withering away of armies to the time when communism wins in the Soviet Union while socialism wins in the world, and the danger of a foreign attack disappears. But even now, the development of socialist society and the growth of democracy are paving the way for a gradual replacement of public management for state management in the fields of economy and culture.

The withering away of the state, as we see, is now under way. The first function to wither away was that of suppressing class enemies. Some functions of the state are now being performed by public organisations, and direct democracy, the contribution every member of society makes to the discussion of laws, to administration and control, is growing.

Only some features of the process are now in evidence. But they are ushering in the period when society will send the machinery of state, as Engels put it, where it belongs—the museum of antiquities.

Some people think that the withering away of the state must inevitably lead to the disappearance of all administration. They imagine that life in communist society is to be a kind of automatic mechanism regulated and put into operation once and for all, and that it will not need any additional regulating and guiding. That is a very primitive notion, which overlooks the requirements of the future society.

It is quite obvious, for example, that communism will call for economic and production planning. The importance

of planning has kept growing in socialist society. The interrelations of the various economic fields are expanding. What seems an insignificant defect in one branch (say, the extraction target or the method of processing raw materials) affects the efficiency of another branch. The interdependence of the various economic regions is growing, and the tie-up of production and consumption is very great, etc. These are trends that will doubtlessly progress.

This means that administration and management will continue to exist in communist society. The difference will be that we shall have *self-management* and *self-administration*. Society will administer the main social processes by itself, from one centre, without any special permanent machinery, while the task of preparing the various decisions will fall to all the members of the collective. The central organs of self-government will be highly democratic, and their membership will change at regular intervals, etc.

Lenin predicted that if all the bodies of the socialist state are to wither away under full communism, the "apparatus of the Supreme Economic Council type is sure to grow, to develop and expand, taking charge of all the chief activities of organised society".¹ Needless to say, the functions of this apparatus will have no political complexion at all.

To sum up, the basic functions of the socialist state—those of managing economy and culture, education, and of determining the measures of labour and consumption—*do not disappear, but are transformed*. Gradually, they shed their compulsive nature, and the whole population is enlisted to fulfil them, both through public organisations and directly.

It is obvious from the above that Stalin was entirely wrong when he declared that the state will wither away by strengthening the dictatorship of the proletariat. By strengthening the state, as we know, he meant strengthening its compulsive organs, which was an obvious departure from the Marxist conception. To follow Stalin's train of thought, the stronger is state compulsion, the better are the conditions prepared for its disappearance.

It is wrong to say that the dictatorship of the proletariat withers away. It only changes into a state of the whole

¹ Lenin, *Speech at the First Congress of National Economic Council*, Vol. 27.

people, and it is this latter that withers away under communism. Secondly, this withering away proceeds through the development of democracy and of the initiative of the working people, through their participation in government. Lastly, as Marx and Lenin noted, the withering away of the state is a process, a gradual process, which gets under way during the transition to communism. With time, the state bodies acquire the features of public organisations, or else they hand over their functions to the public.

It is the growth of socialist democracy, the heightened role of the Party, the trade unions and other public organisations that paves the way to public self-government and the establishment of the organs of such self-government. Ultimately, a new type of universal organisations designed to administer the affairs of society will come into being in the centre and locally. They will make the most of all the effective methods worked out by the state and public organisations, and will in the long run replace them.

The need for compulsion by the state is decreasing, since the people are getting accustomed to respect the laws which they themselves help to frame. Order will gradually become a habit and will in time replace the standards of legal procedure. To be sure, this is dangerous ground, and it would be unwise to be over-hasty. To repeal legal procedure before order has become a habit is likely to lead to lawlessness and abuse. The withering away of state compulsion and the replacement of law by morals will not occur overnight. It is a gradual process, and it will occur at some stage in the development of communist society.

But there is another side to this problem. At one time, Lenin advanced a notion that may, on the face of it, appear paradoxical. He said that the withering away of the state will at once mean the withering away of democracy. What did Lenin mean by that? Will not communism represent such democratic ideals as freedom of the individual, equality and the participation of all people in government? Will society then abandon the basic democratic rule of making decisions subject to the wishes of the majority? Will the principle of electiveness, replacement and accountability be abolished? No, by no means.

On the contrary, these principles will be fully and consistently maintained under communism. What Lenin meant was

that the state will wither away, that power will wither away and that, naturally, the notion of power and hence the notion of democracy, will disappear. After all, democracy *also means the state, it also means power*. No matter what section of modern society you take, democratic administration always has a political complexion. It is associated with the state, it takes support from the state, and it uses the state. That is the feature of democracy which will disappear under communism. "We do not expect the advent of a system of society in which the principle of the submission of the minority to the majority will not be observed," Lenin wrote. "In striving for socialism, however, we are convinced that it will develop into communism and, therefore, that the need for violence against people in general, for the subjugation of one man to another, and of one section of the population to another, will vanish altogether, since people will become accustomed to observing the elementary conditions of social life without violence and without subordination."¹

Under communism government will not have a political complexion. What does that mean? It will be recalled that politics is relations between classes, such relations as are associated to one extent or another with domination and subjugation, with the leadership which one class exercises over another, as are associated with the state, with compulsion. It is these features that will disappear under communism, for there will be no classes then, no subjugation of people by other people, no leadership by one class with respect to others, and no state. Hence, government will not have a compulsive, political complexion. Non-political government based on the unity of all the members of a classless society, on the conscious and voluntary performance of adopted decisions and regulations, is government in which democratic ideals are at their strongest and, therefore, democracy as a political notion will no longer have any sense.

Hence, as the Programme of the C.P.S.U. says, historical development is leading us towards the withering away of the state. The withering away of the state calls for certain internal conditions, the building of a developed communist society, and for certain external conditions, the victory and consolidation of socialism throughout the world.

¹ Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, p. 368.

CONCLUSION

TWO WORLDS—TWO TRENDS OF POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT

The flowering of democracy in the socialist countries, on the one hand, and on the other the increasing curtailment of the already curtailed democracy in the capitalist countries—these are the **two opposite trends in the political development of the contemporary world.**

The C.C. report "On the Programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union".

Let us picture our distant descendant studying our way of life. What will strike his eye first? What will he single out as the sign of the times when speaking of the mid-twentieth century?

Probably, he will be staggered by the dynamism of our epoch, by the unparalleled vigour and purpose of socialism in its competition with capitalism. The young world, the socialist world, hurdles barrier after barrier to overtake and surpass a senile but strong adversary. The first barrier was hurdled in the 1930s when socialism triumphed in the Soviet Union. The second barrier was hurdled in the 1940s when socialism emerged beyond the boundaries of one country and turned into a system of countries embracing more than one-third of mankind. The late fifties were marked by the Soviet Union's entry into the period of full-scale communist construction. In the sixties the socialist world is stepping on the heels of the capitalist countries economically. Step by step, year after year, socialism demonstrates its advantages over capitalism in all spheres.

The Swedish newspaper *Arbetarbladet* noted with alarm in reference to the Programme of the C.P.S.U. that "rapid Soviet progress, coupled with stagnation in the West, will affect world public opinion, and especially that of the poor nations".

That is a striking admission. What is striking, too, is that the newspaper tries to belittle the economic criterion in

appraising a system. It says that the "conflict" between the communist and the "democratic" systems does not involve economy, but rather political freedoms and the rights of the individual. But that is nonsense. The difference between the two systems lies precisely in socialism's ability of satisfying the needs of the workingman better, and that, in turn, is bound up directly with its being able to secure a more rapid increase in the amount of material benefits and make sure that they are fairly distributed among all members of society.

An ordinary comparison of the rates of industrial growth in the Soviet Union and the United States shows that socialism is distinctly superior in that respect. The accretion of industrial output in the Soviet Union amounted to an average 10.1 per cent in the four years of 1958-61. In the United States it amounted to as little as 2.2 per cent. In the Soviet Union steel output increased by 19,600,000 tons. In the United States it decreased by 14,300,000 tons. Between 1957 and 1961 Soviet oil output increased by 67,700,000 tons, or 69 per cent, while in the United States it grew by only 1 per cent.

A lot has been done in the Soviet Union in the last four years to improve the living standard. The national income has risen 38 per cent, and 29 per cent per head of population. The real incomes of the working people have increased substantially. The wages of the low-paid brackets of employees have been raised.

The incomes of the population have also been enhanced by greater public expenditure. Suffice it to say that pensions, grants, stipends, free education, free medical and other services amounted to 26,400 million rubles in 1961, or to 30 per cent more than in 1957. Factory and office workers have had their working day reduced to seven and six hours. The working week was reduced by six and a half hours, while wages remained the same. The Communist Party and the Soviet Government have laid an accent on expanding house building. In four years the country built 315 million square metres of new housing. This is nearly double the housing that existed in the towns and cities of tsarist Russia in 1913. Fifty million Soviet citizens, or a quarter of the population, have moved into new homes over the last five years.

Growing socialist democracy has demonstrated its advantages over the democracy practised in the capitalist countries. It promotes rapid industrial growth, the progress of science, culture and art, and the continuous improvement of the living standard. It is in this context that the socialist countries have grown so powerful and that the Soviet Union has scored striking achievements, such as the launching of the world's first artificial earth satellites, the first flight of a space rocket to the Moon, and the flights of manned spaceships.

What is the source of this socialist energy? Where does socialism get its impetus? There are many sources, but one of the chief sources of progress lies in the profoundly popular nature of socialism. Socialism has liberated the people from exploitation and spiritual slavery. It has roused millions of people and inspired them with a great ideal. It has marshalled them to fight for the bright future. Therein lies the deep-going democracy of the socialist system, a democracy that is not gauged by formal criteria but by the substance of things, by how well the system meets the interests of the masses, how well it improves their living, how well it educates and inspires its citizens, how well it promotes their creative abilities.

The experience of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries shows how the great principles of social progress and the finest democratic ideals of mankind advanced by Marx and Lenin are being embodied in reality under the leadership of the Communist Parties.

We see living confirmation of what Lenin once said, namely, that "*only* under socialism will a rapid, genuine, really mass forward movement, embracing first the *majority* and then the whole of the population, commence in all spheres of public and personal life".¹

Democracy is always the specific form of the socialist state, embodying the power of the people, while bourgeois rule may assume anti-democratic forms, as well as bourgeois-democratic and republican forms.

Let us compare a few well-known facts pertaining to the political order in the capitalist and socialist systems.

¹ Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, p. 382.

According to estimates by the U.S. Congress Commission chairmanned by Thomas Bradford Curtis, the overwhelming majority of 71 countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America belonging to the so-called free world are undisguised tyrannical regimes.

But let us glance at the map of Western Europe. Fascist dictatorships reign in Spain and Portugal, militarists rule in West Germany, where nazi riffraff is rearing its head, and an authoritarian regime has been established in France. This shows that the monopoly bourgeoisie is resorting increasingly to totalitarian forms of rule.

In contrast, working-class rule assumes democratic forms in all cases. All the countries of the socialist community are democratic republics of the socialist type. The world's broadest election laws, the world's broadest system of popular representation based on the principles of electiveness, replacement and accountability, on national and racial equality and the workingman's freedom are being carried into practice there. The governments of the socialist countries carry through a policy of peace and concentrate their efforts on continuously improving the living standard and culture of the masses. This is a popular democratic policy.

The impact of socialist democracy is felt far beyond the countries where it has triumphed. Socialism and its democracy is exercising a tremendous influence on the whole world. This is a new factor, which affects the struggle between the democratic and the reactionary forces in the capitalist countries.

Socialist democracy is a model for the peoples of the capitalist countries struggling for democracy. The other factor influencing the struggle for democratic and socialist ideals in the capitalist countries is the new balance of forces between imperialism and socialism. The scales have tipped visibly in favour of socialism. Lastly, the policy of the socialist countries, designed to support all the democratic forces on earth, to strengthen international peace and promote the peaceful coexistence of different social systems, is another factor influencing this process directly.

This is important for the national liberation movement of the peoples. The example of the socialist countries, and their persevering struggle against imperialism and colonial-

ism, have contributed to the staggering success of the national liberation movement and the development of democracy in the liberated countries.

Yet it is self-evident that the outcome of the struggle between the reactionary and the democratic forces in each capitalist country depends primarily on the internal factors, on the class struggle, the struggle of the antagonistic tendencies discovered by Marx and Lenin.

The facts show that capitalism and socialism pursue two diametrically opposite political trends. The socialist world is steadily promoting socialist democracy, while the capitalist world is operating the other way and curtailing its bourgeois variety of democracy.

The bourgeoisie won power with the slogans of freedom, equality and fraternity. It inscribed these slogans in its constitutions. They were proclaimed to be the creed of the new class, come to replace the power of the feudal lords and kings. But what followed? Backed by its economic power, the big bourgeoisie assaulted the rights of the people. The people fought back and won concessions, such as universal suffrage, in ferocious struggles. But no sooner were these concessions won than the bourgeoisie reduced them practically to nought. There is a distinct tendency to curtail the social basis of bourgeois rule in the capitalist countries. Power is being usurped by exclusive monopoly groups of millionaires and billionaires. People far removed from communism admit today that the United States is bossed by a small group of monopolists who control all the economic and political levers.

The election system in the capitalist countries is patterned to ensure monopoly interests and distort the true will of the population. It is no accident that working people, who comprise the overwhelming majority of the electorate, are only sparsely represented in the parliaments.

Take the United States, that citadel of capitalism, the show-window of the capitalist way of life. There is not a single worker or small farmer in the U.S. Congress. What has become of the traditions fostered by the freedom-loving pioneers, the traditions of Paine and Jefferson, Lincoln and Roosevelt? The rights and freedoms won by the American people in a long and ferocious struggle against the preda-

cious American bourgeoisie are being turned into so much fiction. Not even the bourgeois press is able to deny it. The weekly American *National Guardian* wrote in a summing up of U.S. Congress activities in 1961 that after nine months in Washington the 537 Congressmen of the 87th U.S. Congress worked to confirm a series of dreadful facts. The country's legislative body is reactionary, chauvinist and warlike. It did not want to stamp out McCarthyism and did not want to let the Negroes have equal rights. It opposed an effective national programme of full employment and social improvement. The Congress in 1961 operated under the cold war signboard. Its actions and discussions were aimed most of all at stepping up the arms drive and striking a hard attitude in relation to the socialist world.

In the last few years, the bourgeois states have tended to take repressive measures against the working class, the working people, and their parties. People are persecuted for their thoughts. They do not have to break existing laws to be so persecuted.

To be sure, there are powerful forces opposing the imperialist offensive on democracy in the capitalist countries. These forces are headed by the Communist Parties. The masses are combating the monopolists and militarists, fascism and reaction. They are working for democracy and social progress. The processes of democratic development now under way in the socialist countries serve them as an inspiration and model.

The U.S.S.R. and the other socialist countries are today witnessing a continuous objective tendency, actively and deliberately supported by the Communist Parties, towards a steady development of democracy, greater human rights and freedoms, the development of the Leninist standards of Party and political life. And this occurs at a time when progressives in the bourgeois world are waging a struggle to at least maintain and restore the democratic freedoms won by the peoples of those countries in the past.

The Programme of the C.P.S.U. opens truly imposing horizons for the Soviet people. Socialist democracy will develop, coupled with economic advance and higher living standards. The Programme has registered a phenomenon new to the development not only of the Soviet state but to the political

history of mankind—the development of the state of the whole people, where no class or classes suppress other classes and where the state serves all the classes and sections of society equally. The Programme has outlined measures that will elevate socialist democracy to a still higher level.

The Soviet land is promoting democracy and working for a society where the ideals of Peace, Labour, Freedom, Equality, Fraternity and the Happiness of all nations will triumph.

TO THE READER

Progress Publishers would be glad to have your opinion of this book, its translation and design and any suggestions you may have for future publications.

Please send your comments to 21, Zubovsky Boulevard, Moscow, U.S.S.R.

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics